The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 16, 1895.

The Week.

THE President has performed well the most trying task which confronted him, in the reorganization of the United States Civil-Service Commission. His choice of the one Republican who is to serve in that body was liable to the criticism of all Republicans whose highest conception of partisan duty is partisan querulousness; and any Republican who has been identified with the upbuilding of what may be styled the machinery of civil-service reform is regarded by them with suspicion, as probably a Democrat or Mugwump disguised for some deep and deadly purpose of malevolence. Moreover, three-fourths of the work of the Commission for a few years to come must be done with the Post-office Department, the comparatively recent classification of the free-delivery post-offices having given rise to numberless controversies which are not the less vexatious because obviously short-lived, so that whoever was appointed commissioner was bound to be subject to the keenest hostile scrutiny. Finally, there are reasons which make geographical considerations of more account now than they will be, it is hoped, when public sentiment in favor of civil-service reform has become more evenly distributed over the country. In Major Harlow all the requirements seem to be admirably met. His regular standing as a Republican needs no better certificate than the postmaster's commission voluntarily given him by President Harrison. By the most violent stretch of the spoilsmen's imagination he can hardly be classed as a doctrinaire in civil-service matters after thirty years of service in all grades of public employ. As long as the administration of the Post-office Department remains in Democratic hands, no better guarantee of its honesty could be given than the choice of a Republican expert to watch it and report on its shortcomings. The demand that the civil-service reform movement make itself more distinctly felt in the West is answered by the selection of a commissioner from the heart of the great Mississippi valley. In short, it is hard to discover where the most captious critics will look for material out of which to concoct a complaint against this appointment. A Democrat, Col. William G. Rice of Albany, is named for another of the vacancies. Col. Rice has held office with credit under the State and city governments, and has shown executive ability in business life. Mr. Procter, the holding-over commissioner, has proved himself an efficient administrator, and the board as now constituted will command equally the respect of all good citizens and the hatred of the spoilsmen.

The more one wants to fight foreign nations and "cheek" the universe in arms, the more one ought to desire good discipline in the army and navy. No person ought, therefore, to be so angry with Admiral Meade and so anxious to have him tried and punished as the Jingoes. There is no surer preparation for defeat and humiliation than the appearance of tonguey politicians among the soldiers and sailors. Naval and military "jaw" is the sure forerunner of disaster. A soldier who cannot keep from publicly criticising his own Government is rarely formidable to the enemy. The history of nearly every country in the world has illustrations of this rule. A debating, deliberating army is the curse of any nation, as poor Spain has learned to her cost. The Jingoes, therefore, should now be the foremost in demanding a court-martial on Admiral Meade. He lets the world know that he differed about public affairs with "the Administration," that is, his superior officers; that he was, in common with "the people at large," "disgusted" with it; and that his asking to be relieved, and hauling down his flag, meant that he was unwilling to "continue his connection with it." This shows that the connection was not a military connection, which means silence and subordination, but a political connection, which means free gas, blatherskite, soreheadism, disgruntlement, and sourness. He added that he was "an American and Union man, two things that this Administration cannot stand"—meaning thereby, if he meant anything, that his official superiors were hostile to the Government of the United States and extremely disliked subordinates who were faithful to it. It was this contempt for his official superiors which brought McClellan to ruin, and it was this way of talking about even the *de facto* Government of his country which caused Marshal Bazaine to be condemned to death, and led him to surrender a first-class fortress almost without resistance. The truth is, that this variety of soldier is as a rule not a fighting man. No soldier or sailor when in active service can properly play the part both of a military commander and of a politician. He cannot successfully keep an eye both on the enemy and on home politics. He cannot stand ready both to blow the foe out of the water, or turn his flank on shore, and at the same time stand ready to "quit his connection" with his own Government when he disapproves of its policy. If our Government allowed such talk from its military men to pass unpunished, and at the same time built a large navy, it would pave the way for its own ruin. It is hard to keep any class out of politics in America, but the army and navy must be kept out of it or be abolished. Soldiers must not be allowed to treat their commanders-in-chief as a public enemy.

The Hawaiian minister used to be "pulverizing" Gresham every day or two a few months ago, but even he must admit now that the other fellow is under the millstone. The letter of the Secretary of State demanding his recall, made public on Thursday, contains the record of Mr. Thurston's own abject confession of "official impropriety," and leaves even the head-line editors without a spark of fight in them. What the Hawaiian minister was caught doing was acting as general press agent for the defamers of the Administration and all concerned with it. When confronted with the evidence of his guilt, it did not take his powerful mind long to conclude that he had better take the next steamer home. So far as he is concerned, this close of his diplomatic career is a fitting sequel to its beginning, when he put his name to a document intended to deceive President Harrison and the American people, and which he knew to contain falsehoods. The occasion is a good one to remind the flamboyant press that the net result of their patriotic attacks on their own Secretary of State is, up to date, the wreck of two foreign ministers. No wonder that Mr. Thurston and poor Señor Muruaga thought that Gresham was a spiritless and imbecile creature whom anybody could insult with impunity. Too late they found him as prompt as Washington in the Genest case, ready to take in silence all manner of abuse from the press, but quick to resent attacks on the dignity of the Government by a meddling foreigner.

It is not yet clear what will be the effect of Judge Goff's decision in the United States Circuit Court declaring unconstitutional the registration laws of South Carolina and forbidding the State to take any further action under those laws. The Governor has announced his intention to appeal to the Supreme Court, while still preparing for the convention. The Columbia *State*, organ of the conservative Democrats, points out that the injunction does not apply to the managers of the election, and predicts that the Tillman-Evans element will instruct these managers to go ahead and refuse to receive the ballots of unregistered voters. This would make the election illegal, and, as the Tillmanites can hardly expect to control a convention legally elected, the *State* thinks that they would be glad to escape from the dilemma in this way. Tillman, however, predicts that the convention will be held, and that "it will be composed of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

white men principally, who will take care of South Carolina and see that white supremacy is maintained within its borders." Gov. Evans has issued a fire-eating proclamation of defiance, "Constitution or no Constitution, law or no law, court or no court." The leaders of the negroes, however, talk very sensibly. An address issued by the officers of the Colored Ministerial Union says that they will "vote for and with our white friends for good government, seeking only for that minority representation which any reasonable white man will accord us," and that they "recognize the fact that intelligence and money must rule."

For four months the time and attention of the legislators of Delaware have been largely occupied in the intrigues over the vacant United States Senatorship on which a rich gas speculator named Addicks had set his heart. Public business has been neglected, reforms that were urgently needed have been pushed into the background, the air has been full of charges of attempted bribery, the tone of public sentiment has been lowered, the respect of the people for their lawmakers has been destroyed, the reputation of the State has been smirched. The session ended on Thursday in a snarl that leaves the senatorship in doubt, and renders it probable that the seat will remain vacant for two years. Delaware has no such official as Lieutenant-Governor. The Constitution provides that, "upon any vacancy happening in the office of Governor, the Speaker of the Senate shall exercise the office until a Governor elected by the people shall be duly qualified." It is silent as to the effect of the assumption of the acting governorship upon the office of Senator which he had been filling. The Republican Governor elected last fall died a few weeks ago. The President of the Senate, a Democrat, succeeded as acting Governor. A temporary President of the Senate was chosen in his place, and he occupied the Governor's room. On Thursday afternoon, however, he resumed his position as President of the Senate and claimed the right to vote for Senator. Without him there were twenty-nine votes; fifteen constituted a majority, and Dupont had fifteen (four Republicans remaining faithful to Addicks to the end). With him there were thirty votes; sixteen were required for a majority, and nobody could get sixteen. The session closed with the declaration by the acting Governor and Speaker of the Senate that no choice had been made, and a claim from the floor by the Republican Speaker of the House that the acting Governor had no right to vote, that Dupont had a majority of the legal votes, and that he was elected. The controversy will, of course, be carried to Washington. The acting Governor may perhaps appoint a Democrat as Senator, though the decisive majority cast in the Senate two years ago against the proposition that such a vacancy is one which can be filled by executive appointment leaves small chance of his admission. Dupont will doubtless present his irregular credentials, but it does not seem probable that he will be admitted.

The meeting of the State Bankers' Association at Jackson, Miss., on Thursday, and the speech made by Congressman Catchings endorsing President Cleveland's financial policy and Gov. Stone's position on the silver question, will have an excellent effect in carrying forward the plans of the Memphis sound-currency convention to be held on the 23d of this month. It is now announced that Secretary Carlisle will make five speeches in the South, including the one which he will make at Memphis. Already we hear that the silver-men are intending to assail Mr. Carlisle with questions founded upon his early speeches in Congress on this subject. Undoubtedly he will give satisfactory answers, and none could be more satisfactory than the one which Chief-Justice Chase gave when he dissented from the opinion of the majority of the Supreme Court in the Legal-Tender Cases. He said that reflection had convinced him that he was wrong when, as Secretary of the Treasury, he gave his approval to the legal-tender act. Nobody need be ashamed to say that. Another and greater precedent may be found in the example of St. Paul. Obstinacy in following a wrong policy, after one has begun to doubt its soundness or wisdom, is the mark of feeble minds. If everybody who was captivated with the silver heresy back in the seventies had been determined never to change his opinions, we should have had free coinage at 16 to 1 long ago.

Another glib bimetallic assertion breaks in pieces on the hard facts. We refer to the assertion that the exports of gold-standard countries to silver-standard countries must necessarily decrease in volume and finally disappear. You see, the impossibility of maintaining a "par of exchange" in this case is an almost insuperable bar to international commerce under such conditions; and President Andrews has explained to us what a golden opportunity (of course he must have meant silver opportunity) the United States has to wrest from England and Germany their foreign trade with silver-standard nations by ourselves going to the silver standard. Now comes Herr Soetbeer the younger, in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, and proves that England's and Germany's exports to silver countries have not fallen off as silver has declined in value, but have increased, in proportion to the total exports, since 1889. In that year the per cent. to silver countries of the total English exports was 2.7; in 1893 it was 3.6. The corresponding figures for Germany are 15.7 and 16.1. As Horace Greeley used to say, "Is there to be no end of lying?"

Lord Farrer's question to the English bimetallists, asking what ratio they propose to adopt for international free coinage, has brought out some differences of opinion among them, but has not dampened their ardor. Some of them are in favor of 15½ to 1, others go for 16, still others for 20. One man has hit upon the magic ratio of 23½. Another naïvely asks Lord Farrar whether he would accept 25. But most of them are in the happy frame of our own Tim Campbell, who would not allow a little thing like the Constitution of the United States to stand between friends. A little thing like a ratio ought not to stand in the way of a great reform in the currency systems of the world. The bimetallists remind us of Ben Wade when, as the head of the committee on the conduct of the war, he insisted to President Lincoln that Gen. McClellan should be removed. "Whom shall we put in his place?" asked Mr. Lincoln. "Anybody," said Wade. "Oh, *anybody* will do for you," replied Lincoln, "but I must have *somebody*." So it is with the bimetallists. A broad general ratio will answer for them, but the business world requires a particular ratio. In this emergency Prof. Foxwell has suggested a "climbing ratio," which begins with the market ratio, say 32 to 1, and then climbs (up or down) to the historical ratio of 15½. We fancy that the pupils of 'Coin's Financial School' will have something to say about this when the time comes.

The gradual fall of sterling exchange is the full vindication and complete triumph of the bond-syndicate transaction of last February. That operation had for its main object the quieting of the public mind until business in this country could get on a better basis. The public mind that needed quieting was not merely the American but the foreign as well. It was supremely necessary that the possessors of floating capital on both sides of the ocean should be convinced that the gold standard would be maintained here. The first step to this end was to stop gold shipments and at the same time to turn the gold movement in this direction. A mere replenishment of the gold in the Treasury, if the outflow to Europe continued, would have availed nothing. The second fifty-million loan lasted less than three months. A third one, of the same kind, would not have lasted one month. What killed the panic was the drop of sterling exchange below the gold-shipping point. The Government had no apparatus for accomplishing this end. The syndicate had. It was impossible to pay too high a price for this service, since it was the foundation and *sine qua non* of the business revival which has since taken place, and of which we have gratifying evidence from day to day.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG.
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Judge Lawrence is on the war-path again. He writes to the editor of the *Reporter:*

"Unless the New England States stand up strong for adequate wool protection, the country will be driven to favor free woollen goods. You will not believe it. The slaveholders would not believe that slavery extension would endanger them, so they drove on and slavery fell. You are following a similar road. I regret it."

This is the old "howling-waste" argument. Unless the Ohio wool-growers got their bounty, Olneyville should be a resort for jackals, and the bittern should perch on the ruins of Dobson's factories. But the Judge should not be thus envious at the prosperity of the wicked. It doubtless galls him, as it does the *Tribune*, to see the woollen-manufacturers thrive, so humorously careless of protectionist oracles of woe, but he and his fellow-woolites can similarly thrive if they adopt similar means. Enterprise and intelligence applied to wool-growing will do for it what they have done for woollen-manufacturing. Moreover, when American woollens are beginning to be sold right in Bradford, the Judge's threat of free woollens does not carry with it anything like its old terrors.

Commissioner Roosevelt's acts and words since entering upon his duties give gratifying assurance that the high expectations formed of his usefulness in the Police Department will be realized. He says that his personal regret that the examinations for admission to the force have been taken away from the Civil-Service Commission and given to the Police Board is shared by his fellow-Commissioners, and adds: "But, having this duty imposed upon us, we propose to conduct the examinations on civil-service lines: there will be open competitive examinations for all positions, and every man will come in on his merit, without regard to his politics." Mr. Roosevelt's assurance on this point is all that the public will need to convince it that the examinations will be what he says they will. Of course the evil results of the new system will be felt as soon as we get a commission which does not share the views of the present one.

"Lou" Payn's unblushing confession on the stand on Thursday that he was Platt's corruption agent at Albany, buying and selling legislation for corporations at the bidding of his master, merely makes matter of public record what was well known before. We commend also to the attention of the Union League Republicans who are so fond of doing things at the demand of their friends "up the State," Payn's statement that "for thirty-five years he had been interested in the election of Speakers, United States Senators, and that sort of thing," coupled with the remark that he "did not work for fun." The *Tribune*, owing doubtless to "pressure on its space," did not find room for these revelations. But it will not, for that reason, intermit its severe condemnation of corruption at Washington. Speaking of Washington, a great many people are saying that the record of the last Congress for imbecility and corruption and defiance of the popular will is pushed very hard by that of the present New York Legislature. If virtuous Republican editors had not exhausted themselves and their adjectives in denouncing Democratic incompetence, we might look for some remarks on Republican incompetence. But they are too busy getting ready to "pull all together for 1896."

Careful examination of the bi-partisan police law strengthens the conviction that, instead of being in any way an improvement upon the old law, it is in many ways a more objectionable statute. While it was pending, public attention was directed mainly towards its bi-partisan requirement and the provision removing the examinations of candidates for the force from the Civil-Service Commission. Now it is discovered that it contains a provision forbidding the appointment for chief of police of any one except the deputy chief or an inspector or a captain. This makes it impossible to go outside the force for a head, and, of course, adds greatly to the difficulty of reforming the force. Then, too, it was urged for the bi-partisan idea that commissioners of opposite political faiths were especially desired in order that transfers of duty for policemen at the polls on election day might be made by them; the claim being that Kerwin and Murray aided powerfully in the defeat of Tammany last year by ordering such transfers. Now it appears that the bi-partisan law takes this power to transfer from the board and bestows it on the Chief of Police. That is to say, the bi-partisan object of the bi-partisan law is defeated by the law itself. This shows what a wonderful legislator Lexow is, and it shows also what a wonderful lot of legislators the Republican members from "above the Harlem" are when they clamor for and secure the enactment of a law which does precisely the opposite of what they think it is doing.

We hear much of the dangers of socialism, French, German, and other, with its propositions for the confiscation of property, but a nearer danger is that public treasuries the world over will be wrecked by waste and extravagance. The French Minister of Finance goes on his knees to the Chamber to beg that expenses may be kept down, no more sinecures created, no more useless railways built on state account. Ex-Speaker and to-be Speaker Reed sounds a note of alarm in reference to the next Congress, hoping that Representatives from all parts of the country will go to Washington prepared to surrender meekly all their little appropriation bills, so as to keep down the nation's outlay. What the appropriations are wanted for, why they are so swollen from year to year, is clearly shown by the revelations made almost daily in New Jersey, at Albany, and in this city. Direct stealing has to be provided for on a large scale, and indirect stealing on a still larger. By the latter we mean, of course, the creation of useless offices, the payment of extravagant wages, and a general willingness to "work" the Treasury for all it will stand. The report of the Commissioners of Accounts, summarized in the *Evening Post* of Saturday, shows what fine pickings the care of the municipal buildings has afforded. Double the number of employees actually needed, wages far above the market rates, decrepit relatives and absentee friends in a political emergency foisted on the pay-roll—these are the well-known phenomena which the Commissioners set forth. Such methods, given full swing in State and nation, will soon bring government into so miserable an estate that the Socialists will hardly think it worth while to take the bankrupt concern over.

Mr. Balfour's Primrose Day speech was devoted mainly to eulogy of Mr. Chamberlain, and to showing how indissoluble is the alliance between the Liberal-Unionists and the Conservatives. He admitted, however, that the present arrangement could not go on for ever, and predicted complete absorption of the Unionists by the Conservatives. What the united party was to stand for was, of course, defence of the Constitution and the Church, but in addition it was going to be a mighty bulwark of individual liberty, and a strong fortress against socialism. This would go to the very foundations of belief, did we not, unhappily, have a contemporaneous Conservative platform to show us just what Conservative opposition to socialism means. In the Mid-Norfolk bye-election of April 24 the candidate who wrested the seat from the Liberals promised the electors that, "instead of trying to destroy constitutions or pull down churches," he would go in for "useful social reforms, such as providing better houses for the working classes, finding them what land they may require at a fair price, and making some provision for their old age." As Mr. Balfour guarantees this programme to be anti-socialistic, we must infer that the better houses are to grow like mushrooms, the land to be found in unexplored parts of England, and the old-age pensions to be let down from heaven. The whole thing must seem to Chamberlain like one of Mr. Balfour's neatest sallies. Chamberlain has a pretty idea of socialism himself, and, when he gets to be Tory Chancellor of the Exchequer, will develop schemes that will make Sir William Harcourt's confiscatory budget seem fairly Arcadian in its simplicity.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOUTH CAROLINA CRISIS.

It is a singular coincidence that the State which precipitated the war of secession through its attempted repudiation of the Federal Constitution a generation ago should now again bring to the test another question of hardly inferior importance—the question how far the Government of the United States, under the amended Constitution, may interfere with the processes of State laws when those laws affect the highest prerogative of a State in the formation of a constitution for the commonwealth. For this is the issue that has been before Judge Goff in the United States Circuit Court at Columbia, and was passed upon by him on Wednesday week.

By itself, the decision of Judge Simonton, another Federal judge, at Columbia on the same day, practically annulling essential provisions of the Dispensary act as in violation of the Interstate Commerce law, would be important enough to engage general attention, but it sinks into insignificance in comparison with the broader questions and wider consequences involved n the other case. Every citizen of every State is concerned in this latter decision, because the whole issue of State rights is bound up in it.

The present Constitution was adopted in 1868, during the reconstruction era, when the carpet-baggers and negroes were "on top"; and although there has been agitation for a new one ever since the native whites resumed control in 1876-'77, no steps were taken in that direction until Tillman came into power. The last Legislature passed an act providing that an election for delegates to a constitutional convention should be held on the third Tuesday in August next, and that the body should meet on the second Tuesday in September. Certain citizens of South Carolina last month applied to the Circuit Court of the United States for an injunction to restrain the State officials from taking further action under the registration and election laws, on the ground that those laws are in violation both of the State Constitution and of the Federal Constitution. Judge Goff granted a temporary injunction, and on May 8 made it permanent.

The chief points of attack were two. The State Constitution provides that "every inhabitant possessing the qualifications provided for in this Constitution shall have an equal right to elect officers." The qualifications are that one shall be a male citizen of the United States twenty-one years old, a resident of the State one year, and of the county in which he offers to vote sixty days, next preceding the election. The Constitution further provides that "the right of suffrage shall be protected by laws regulating elections," and that "it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to provide from time to time for the registration of all electors."

In 1882 a registration act was enacted, which still remains on the statute-book, and which was enlarged by amendments passed in 1893 and 1894. The practical effect of these provisions is that, for an ordinary election occurring in November, registration ceases early in July (except for those afterwards coming of age), which operates to require a residence in the county of 120 days—in violation, as is contended, of the constitutional requirement of only 60 days' residence. For the election of next August, registration was to be allowed until a month previous, but the difficulties put in the way of getting on the roll the name of any man objectionable to the supervisor are almost incredibly great. A man who is once registered must preserve the certificate then given him and show it at the polls as a condition of voting—which, it is alleged, is a new qualification for the exercise of the suffrage not warranted by the Constitution. If he moves, not simply from one county to another, but even from one precinct to another, and even from one residence to another in the same precinct, he must surrender his old certificate and get a new one. If he loses his certificate, he can get a new one only by proving to the satisfaction of the supervisor, upon such evidence as the latter may require, that he really lost it, and has not destroyed or sold it. If he has never been registered, he must make an affidavit setting forth his full name, age, occupation, and residence when the act of 1882 was passed, or at any time thereafter when he became old enough to vote, "and the place or places of his residence since the time when he became entitled to register"; and this must be supported by the affidavits of two "reputable" citizens who were each twenty-one years old in 1882, or at the time when the applicant became entitled to register. These, and sundry other provisions unnecessary to chronicle, are, it is held, in violation of the State Constitution, as establishing qualifications for the suffrage not required or warranted by that instrument.

The other chief point is the claim that these State laws violate the Federal Constitution. The latter provides that the electors of the lower branch of Congress in each State "shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature." These qualifications, it is contended, must be set down in the State Constitution, and any attempt by State law to establish other qualifications violates the right of the citizen to vote for members of Congress, and so is obnoxious to the Federal Constitution. The fifteenth amendment forbids any abridgment of the right of citizens of the United States to vote "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." While the registration law in question does not specifically discriminate against the negro, its rigorous provisions regarding the procurement of a certificate, its preservation, and its restoration if lost, are notoriously directed against the ignorant and migratory blacks. A justification for an appeal to the Federal judiciary is found in the provision of the Federal Constitution that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government," and in the contention that the practical effect of the registration laws of South Carolina is to put that State under the rule of a white oligarchy.

The main reliance of the attorneys on the other side was the argument that the action was virtually directed against the State, and so was forbidden by the eleventh amendment, declaring that "the judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state"—though the present action, it will be observed, was brought by citizens of the State itself. It was also argued that the matters complained of were political rather than judicial, and consequently not the subject of judicial cognizance, and that adequate remedies for any grievance might be obtained at law in the State courts. Judge Goff, however, brushed these contentions aside, and made the injunction permanent on the ground of the unconstitutionality of the registration laws.

The case will, no doubt, be carried up to the Supreme Court of the United States. Unless, however, there is immediate action and that tribunal takes up the question out of order, no decision can be reached until next autumn, as the court's summer recess is near at hand. In that case the election for members of the convention cannot be held, unless the Governor at once summons the Legislature in special session to pass a new registration law. Gov. Evans, who seems as youthful in mind as in years, at first declared that he should "treat the proceeding with the contempt it deserved," but he has learned something during the past fortnight, and now announces that "we will take no action without mature deliberation."

VARIOUS REPLIES TO "COIN."

The amount of literature to which 'Coin's Financial School' has given birth is increasing every day. A pamphlet of high merit, entitled 'Coin's Financial School Answered,' by John G. Floyd, editor of the *Banker's Magazine*, has been issued from the office of the latter publication. This contains not only an exposure of the particular fallacies and falsehoods of the misleading book to which it is a reply, but also special articles on wheat prices and cotton prices—the former by Mr. Alfred C. Stevens, editor of *Bradstreet's*, and the latter by Mr. Samuel T. Hubbard, jr. These articles show that the statistics of production and consumption of wheat and cotton fully account for the variations in price, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the money supply has nothing to do with it.

Next in the list is an admirable catechism of 174 pages, entitled, 'What Is Money? A Discussion of the Silver Question, with a Brief Historical Account of the Coinage Legislation of the United States,' by Rozel Weissinger of the Louisville Bar, published by the *Courier-Journal* Printing Company, Louisville. Mr. Weissinger is a practised writer and debater on financial questions, and also knows how to put his ideas in plain language for plain people. Another work, more on the plane of 'Coin's Financial School' itself, is entitled, 'Cash vs. Coin,' and is published by Charles H. Kerr & Co., 175 Monroe Street, Chicago. This is an illustrated work of 121 pages. Still another is entitled '$ or ?' *i. e.*, 'Dollars or What?' by W. B. Mitchell of Chattanooga, Tenn.

Another work, of a serial kind, has been undertaken by Prof. Laughlin in the columns of the Chicago *Times and Herald*. This is a methodical exposure of the falsities of 'Coin's Financial School.' "Coin" had the impudence to introduce the professor as an attendant at his lectures and to put a lot of foolishness into his mouth for himself to answer. This was such a dirty trick that the professor at first intended to pass it over with silent contempt; but when he learned that most of the readers of the book took it *au grand sérieux*, and thought that he (Laughlin) had really been at the "school" and had said the things ascribed to him, he decided to make it hot for the rascal who had put him in a false light before the country. The result is a series of articles showing up the lies in the book and blasting it thoroughly. For example, as to the "crime of 1873," *i. e.*, the charge that the coinage act of that year was passed secretly or silently, he takes up the legislative history of the bill and puts in tabular form the principal events of its course through Congress, showing that it was before that body nearly three years, that it was received in the usual way from the Secretary of the Treasury, was printed and referred to the proper committee of the House, reported back with amendments, printed again, debated, passed, sent to the Senate, printed again, etc., etc.; the dates being given in each case. As the Forty-first Congress expired after the bill had passed one house, but before it became a law, it was taken up again in the Forty-second Congress, and all the proceedings were repeated. This was the reason why it was before Congress so long a time—two years and ten months.

When the silverites are confronted with these facts, they have nothing better to say than that the newspapers of the country did not take any notice of the measure at the time. The author of 'Coin's Financial School' delivered a lecture on this theme at Minneapolis—a real lecture, not a bogus one like those at the Art Institute in Chicago—in which he took pains to read from the files of various newspapers of the time when this bill passed, in order to show that the reporters did not say that silver had been demonetized, although they did say that the coinage act was passed. As silver had been virtually demonetized in 1834, there was no reason why they should say it. But their saying it or not saying it made no difference as to the good faith of Congress in passing the law. Take up the statute-book of that year and see how many other laws the newspapers of Chicago and of Minneapolis reported in detail. If the criticism means anything, it means that the newspaper reporters of that day were in the conspiracy to prevent the public from knowing what Congress was doing in reference to silver. This is a falsehood as barefaced as the statement that the bill was passed secretly.

Perhaps the most valuable contribution in Prof. Laughlin's series is his exposure of "Coin's" juggling with the prices of farm products. He shows that "Coin" took one article only (wheat) because that one had declined in price, and then tried to make people believe that if wheat had declined, everything else had declined, whereas corn, oats, and pork are as high now in gold as they were in 1873. Although wheat has declined very considerably since 1873, it is a fact that a given number of bushels of it will buy more farm implements and machinery now than they would then. The professor presents a table showing the number of bushels of wheat, corn, and oats respectively that were required to buy the seventeen agricultural implements named in 1873 and also in 1889, from which it appears that in 1873 all those kinds of implements required 569.4 bushels of wheat to buy them, and after "the crime of 1873" only 388.1 bushels. "But," continues Prof. Laughlin, "when the comparison is made between implements and corn or oats, the gain of the farmer is something quite surprising since 1873. In 1873 a binder could be bought by no less than 769.2 bushels of corn and in 1889 by only 421.8. The difference is amazing. Corn has not fallen at all in comparison with gold, but the articles bought by the farmer have. All those implements required in 1873 no less than 1,645.1 bushels of corn to buy them, while in 1889 they could be bought by only 886.7, or about one-half. And the same thing is true of oats in nearly the same degree."

Prof. Laughlin's exposures of the other falsities in 'Coin's Financial School,' as far as he has gone, are as thorough as those which we have here noticed. We hope that he will pursue them to the end.

THE MAYOR AND THE BI-PARTISAN BILL.

Mayor Strong's approval of the bi-partisan police bill suggests several considerations. In the first place, we may allege, without fear of contradiction, that had he declared, in answer to the Committee of Seventy, that he would accept such a bill for the city, he would not have been nominated, or, if nominated, would not have been elected. This is as plain an induction from all the facts of the situation last fall as is possible in politics. The platform of the Committee of Seventy, on which he was nominated, says:

> "We demand that the public service of this city be conducted upon a strictly non-partisan basis; that all subordinate appointments and promotions be based on civil-service examinations, and that all examinations, mental and physical, be placed under the control of the Civil-Service Commission."

His answer to this was, that the platform "met with his entire approval," that he would "administer the affairs of the government of the city in the interests of good government, and absolutely non-partisan," and that he "would make all appointments without regard to party lines." It was these declarations that drew the majority which elected him. It is not unfair to assume, that had he said that he would approve and accept on behalf of the city a bill making bi-partisanship compulsory in the composition of the Police Commission, and taking from the Civil-Service Commission the control of the examinations for admission to the force, tens of thousands would have treated his application for their votes as absurd.

In the second place, it does not seem as if the facts of the case left an opening for a misunderstanding of which the charitably disposed could give the Mayor the benefit. There is no interpretation of the terms "bi-partisan" and "non-partisan" under which an honest man can take shelter if he uses the one when people expect him to use the other. Non-partisan appointments mean appointments made without any more reference to the candidate's political opinions than to his religious opinions, and with an eye solely to his fitness for the office. Bi-partisan appointments mean appointments made mainly with reference to a man's political opinions, and for the express purpose of making him in his office a representative of the party to which he belongs. It is impossible to confound them. Mayor Strong has not confounded them. He knows that the bill of which he approves requires that the Police Commission shall contain four partisans, and that the object in putting them there is to enable them to look after the interests of their party. He knows, too, that the Committee of Seventy had not in their mind any such body when they nominated him. They were then filled with horror over the working of a board made bi-partisan solely by usage or courtesy. Had he said, "If you elect me, I shall approve of giving this courtesy or usage, the results of which so shock you, the force of law, and making it permanent and perpetual," would they have thought for a moment of nominating him?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That he did not misunderstand the demand of the Committee of Seventy for the removal of examinations for admission to the police force from the control of the Police Board, is shown by the fact that, almost immediately after coming into office, he so altered the civil-service regulations as to take from the police the partial control they had previously exercised over the conditions of appointment to the police force, to exclude from all share in the examinations the police officers who had previously served on the examining board, and to place every step in the process under the control of the Civil-Service Commission. This was plainly what the Committee of Seventy desired, and his change in the regulations showed that the Mayor so understood them. When they put this plank in their platform, they were filled with indignation over the abuses which had resulted from even the partial control of the Police Board over the nominations. One of these was the conversion of appointments and promotions into articles of merchandise, the proceeds of which the bi-partisan Commissioners divided between them. The present bill, however, destroys even the slight check on them which the Civil-Service Commission formerly exerted, and hands over the whole work of selection and appointment to the Police Commission—an arrangement which even Gilroy did not dare to ask for, much as he would have liked it, or Croker's Legislature, with all its audacity, dare to provide. The only possible excuse for this is that the Mayor will provide such good Commissioners that they will not imitate their predecessors, but the Committee of Seventy had considered this and disallowed it. They did not say that the Mayor was such a good man that he might be trusted to do as he pleased in the matter. They said, "This is our view of what the organization of the force requires, and we will nominate no man who does not agree with us."

We have reserved to the end what we consider the saddest part of this unhappy business, and that is the adoption by the Mayor, without a murmur, of the Platt pretence that a bi-partisan board is necessary to secure fair elections. All we know as to the opinion of the country people on this subject we hear from Plattite politicians. We cannot recall the report of one disinterested person on that subject. That they demand it, we have no trustworthy evidence. But even if they had demanded it, might we not fairly have expected a reform mayor of New York to tell them in manly tones that our experience in this city during the last twenty years proved that they were grossly mistaken; that cheating went on freely at all elections, owing to the low character of the Police Commissioners and the indiscipline of the police force, and that bi-partisanship in the board, instead of curing it, aggravated it; and that the absolute rejection by the Plattites, without reason or discussion, of the plan of taking away the control of the elections from the police, and giving it to a bi-partisan election bureau, showed clearly that the demand for police supervision was a demand not for fair elections, but for the means of rewarding the Murrays and the Kerwins and other paltry adventurers who live on our corruption or supineness? It was a mayor who would have done this in words that would sound like a trumpet-call to the conscience and reason and public spirit of the State, that we hoped we had secured, but whom it is plain we must manage to do without.

We will not go so far as to say with some downcast friends of reform to-day, that we have gained nothing by Mayor Strong's election. How much we have gained it will be impossible to tell till we see what kind of police magistrates he selects. But we are obliged to confess that the good we have got from it is largely due thus far to the badness of Tammany. The city had sunk so low that any change was sure to be a change for the better. Nearly every appointment made, except Col. Waring's, has been made on partisan grounds, and this with a persistence which leads charitable people to suppose that Mayor Strong really understood by non-partisan *multi-partisan*—that is, offices for all parties instead of offices for one party. Let us hope that this explanation has something in it. It is the only road out of the bewilderment which saves his credit without damage to our intelligence.

The consequences most to be feared from what has happened are two in number. One is, that it will encourage the Plattites and the politicians of both parties to believe that there is no fear of their losing New York as a field of intrigue and plunder; that as long as they can retain their hold on the Legislature, the city offices and revenues may be relied on to furnish materials for "deals," and that no popular "rising" will ever really threaten their power. The other is, that the enthusiasm for righteousness which was roused with such difficulty last summer, and, when roused, did such mighty things, and, with the law on its side and the offices in its possession, might, under competent leadership, have laid the foundation of a new city, will fade under this heavy blow. We trust this will not prove true, but there is no disguising the fact that the work of redemption is likely to prove much longer than people supposed, and a severer trial of faith and courage.

EMBARRASSED FOREIGN MISSIONS.

THE veteran secretary of the American Board of Foreign Missions, Dr. N. G. Clark, wrote lately in the *Outlook* of "the decline of popular interest in foreign missions at the present time." As a most practical proof of such decline, he mentioned the embarrassed finances of the missionary boards. Some of them are burdened by heavy debts. The treasurer of the Presbyterian Board has just published his annual statement, soon to be laid before the General Assembly, and from it we learn that the fiscal year closed with a deficit of $176,000—about one-fifth of the usual total income. The year before, the deficit was $102,000.

Dr. Clark denies that "the prevailing financial depression" is enough to account for this situation. Money can be had in plenty for religious and charitable work that arouses enthusiasm. But the edge somehow appears to have been taken off the missionary appeal. Tested by the practical response, says this experienced mission secretary, "the argument from the moral degradation and wretchedness of the great masses of the non-Christian nations seems to have lost its power." What is the explanation?

Partly, we think, the passing of the missionary movement from its romantic and heroic into its prosaic and business-like aspect. One reason, we presume, for the high character and remarkable achievements of the pioneer missionaries is that the cause, at the time it appealed to them in their young manhood, was one to stir the pulses of the finest natures. Men like Calhoun and Goodell and Coan and Duff and Livingston were of large mould, could see the immense opportunities to be grasped and the vast influence to be wielded by those first in the field, and went out not simply under the stress of powerful religious motives, but with the zest and eagerness of explorers and adventurers. Seventy-five years have changed all that. System and organization, necessary but deadening, have made a business like any other out of the missionary life. Missionary service is as well established as the India service, as a regular means of livelihood, and missionaries come and go in shoals, with motives doubtless as excellent as ever, but with an inevitable loss of the old-time distinction and influence. This dulling of the interest and imagination that used to attach to their office necessarily affects their cause also in the popular mind.

We can but agree, too, with what Dr. Clark says about the effect of the world's knowing the heathen better. Travel and world's-fairs and parliaments of religion and the going to and fro of the newspaper correspondent have revealed unsuspected heathen virtues, some of which we might copy to advantage. The coming of Buddhist and Mohammedan missionaries to our own shores is rather a grotesque affair, to be sure, and smacks a good deal of a spirit of bravado, yet it witnesses to a growing feeling that the advantages are not all on one side. In the face of this better knowledge of many of those peoples whom we have been wont promiscuously to call heathen, it has been getting more and more impossible to be so sure that they have everything to learn from us, and we nothing from them. It is this, we believe, as much as any relaxation of theological fibre, which makes missionary

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speakers nowadays so shy about asserting the damnation of the Chinese or Hindus unless the Gospel is sent them, and so ready to insist upon the humanitarian, brotherly aspect of missionary labors.

But the deepest cause, we suspect, of the decline of interest in missions is the fact that they have been so long conducted on what may be called the crisis theory. The chosen theme of missionary orators for a generation at least has been the critical situation of the heathen world. Japan was evidently going to experience a mighty national change, and how ought Christian efforts and contributions to be directed towards making sure that that change should be a national adoption of Christianity! The millions of India were swaying in the balance, to be won or lost for Christianity, and the next few years would tell the story. That is substantially what has been said in a hundred pulpits and before thousands of missionary gatherings—but it has been said for thirty years steadily. No wonder that the perpetual crisis has got to be a little stale. Hard-headed pew-owners see that the world wags on much as usual. They hear of the new crisis in Japan, but they remember a whole series of Japanese missionary crises, away back to Perry's time, and they button up their pockets as resolutely as Franklin did his in the first part of Whitefield's sermon.

There are signs, however, that a different spirit and a different style of appeal are coming in. Canon Scott Holland recently made a missionary address on the slowness of mission work, in which he distinctly admitted that the old eager expectation of immediate results was mistaken, and affirmed that the real glory and truest success of missionary labors were to be found in long and patient teaching and training and waiting. It seems clear, in fact, that missionary boards must take long looks ahead, and urge plodding work and giving in place of spasmodic. Let them frankly admit, what is practically the truth, that the heathen are very well contented as they are, that they do not want to be converted, that the work of influencing them must necessarily be long and arduous, and must be accomplished more through schools and hospitals and training in the arts of civilization than by impulsive preaching. With such a clear understanding all round, a solid basis to stand upon would soon be reached, and we should not be likely to see this alternation of swollen receipts and a crippled treasury.

VICTORIOUS JAPAN.

TOKYO, April 15, 1895.

To an impartial observer, Japan has pre-eminently displayed three qualities in her struggle with her gigantic neighbor. The first of these is the moderation of her conduct towards China in declaring war. It is now known* that not Japan but China was the first to contemplate war. As long ago as 1882 the Chinese Government seriously discussed the question of invading Japan and reducing her to a subject State, and Li Hung Chang was repeatedly urged to assume the responsibility of conducting the armies of China against her smaller neighbor. Li Hung Chang was, however, far too astute to undertake the expedition, because he was aware far more than the ordinary Chinese officials that China was in no wise prepared for such an enterprise. Though these proposals were supposed to be a profound state secret, they were soon disclosed to the Japanese Government, and produced at the time the greatest excitement in military circles. The truth is, China has never forgiven Japan for discarding Oriental in favor of Western civilization. It was only a question of time, therefore, when the Chinese Government would seek an opportunity of revenge against her island neighbor for her recreant conduct, and Japan in turn was resolved to be ready and possibly even the aggressor in the inevitable contest. On no theory except that China has been contemplating war for many years, can we explain the enormous amount of ammunition which the Japanese have found stored away in all the places they have thus far captured. Considering all these circumstances, we are bound to acknowledge that the Government of Japan acted with the greatest fairness and forbearance, at least in the preliminary stages of the war.

Not less creditable to Japan, moreover, was her complete readiness for beginning the war. Not only did she have her soldiers in perfect training, so far as the appropriations for the army would permit; not only was her navy in a state of great efficiency; but, like the Prussians with regard to France in 1870-71, the Japanese military authorities had a far better knowledge of the state of China than the Chinese themselves. The military maps of China in possession of the Japanese Government are models of excellence, when we consider the condition of affairs in China and the difficulty of getting accurate topographical information. All roads and distances are so minutely drawn, towns and even villages are marked in such detail, that the wonder grows how the Japanese were able to gather all this knowledge in a country with so few facilities for a careful survey. It is evident that the Japanese Government has quietly been engaged for many years in the preparation of these ordnance maps. The military authorities have shown a perfect acquaintance with the position and resources of the Chinese fortresses, their strong points as well as their defects. Without going into detail, we may say that the Japanese have shown wonderful knowledge, skill, and efficiency, while the Chinese have not understood or appreciated the importance of the simplest defensive tactics.

Most important of all, however, in the present war is the thorough organization of the Japanese army and its entire military equipment. In some respects the Japanese have advantages for carrying on war, even over Western countries, in the peculiarly simple character of their civilization. Their commissariat can dispense with many things which in the West would be considered almost necessities. They do not need draught-horses, since most of the hauling in Japan is done by coolies, who are strong, active, intelligent, and almost invariably good-natured. Good roads are in consequence far less a necessity to the Japanese commissariat than they are in the West. Where roads do not exist at all, they can resort to pack-horses, a mode of conveyance much practised in the interior mountainous districts of Japan. The Japanese artisan is laborious and dexterous. He can quickly adapt himself to new conditions, and, with the simplest tools in the world, he can make almost any article of ordinary utility. For instance, I have seen five or six Japanese carpenters, with perhaps two dozen tools, build a very good house in a primeval forest within a month without resort to machinery or any manufactured commodity except perhaps a few nails and a small amount of paper. The working classes can sleep comfortably on a straw mat, three feet by six, with a single thick quilt. The Japanese Government has utilized to the fullest extent all these advantages for the army and especially the commissariat. Even in Tokyo, which is remote from the seat of war, tinsmiths may be seen busily engaged in putting up meats and vegetables in small tin boxes (each box containing a single man's rations), of which a certain number are packed in a large tin case. A special body of coolies has been organized by the War Department to transport all the military stores to the railways, and the whole process goes on so quietly and smoothly that the ordinary currents of business and commerce are undisturbed. Indeed, so far as Tokyo is concerned, it is difficult to imagine that Japan is engaged in war.

Newspaper correspondents and military attachés testify to a similar orderliness and organization of the forces in the field. The Japanese soldiers have shown courage in action almost at times to the point of temerity. They are as a rule indifferent to danger or death, but courage and audacity have always distinguished the Japanese soldier. On the other hand, organization is a wholly unique element in the Japanese army. In the past history of Japan we have endless stories of individual courage, but very little of the general plan of the battles. But the Japanese at present acknowledge that the distinctive superiority of their armies over those of China lies almost wholly in perfect organization—a result of close study of European models adapted to Japanese conditions. The Chinese often show no lack of cases of individual courage, but of moving and acting in concert we see not a trace. Their armies seem to be merely a collection of atoms in juxtaposition without any cohesive force. Never before, perhaps, has the value of organization and social cohesion been proved more strikingly than in the present contest between China and Japan.

Because of the presence of these excellent qualities in the Japanese, all the more flagrant appear the lapses from them, as in the Port Arthur massacre and the want of provision for the safety of Li Hung Chang. While these exceptions are grave, they stand out in strong contrast to the general conduct of the army and the Government. And if the Japanese have the moral force that they ought to have, they will turn these lapses to good account. A repetition of the Port Arthur affair would to-day be far more difficult than its original occurrence, if for no better reason than that foreign critics have shown the inconsistency between Japanese professions and practices. Similarly, there are signs that public opinion is crystallizing against the *soshi* in a way never before seen, and if the final result of the attempted assassination be the extinction of soshi-ism—this relic of Chinese teaching—the price paid, though a species of vicarious atonement, would not be too high for so great a consummation.

G. D.

* See the London *Times* of Feb. 19, 1895.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CURTIUS FESTIVAL AT OLYMPIA.

ATHENS, April 21, 1895.

THE great event of the month to those interested in archæology has been the recent festival held at Olympia in honor of Prof. Ernst Curtius's eightieth birthday—an anniversary which, it will be remembered, was celebrated with much éclat in Berlin on the 2d of last September. It was decided then to postpone the celebration at Olympia until the following spring, that being a better season of the year for visiting Greece. To the archæological world it seemed a peculiarly happy idea to meet at Olympia in honor of the venerable savant who had been the means of bringing its long buried treasures to the light again, after so many centuries of oblivion. Accordingly, the gathering at Olympia yesterday to witness the unveiling of the bust of Curtius included representatives from many nations and of various branches of art and letters. From an early hour in the morning the sacred Altis was thronged by an immense crowd of countryfolk, who, in their gay costumes, grouped picturesquely about under the trees on the surrounding slopes, made up a scene which vividly brought to mind the descriptions of the ancient gatherings at Olympia. In the middle of the large central hall of the Museum, with the gods on either side and the beautiful Victory of Paionios behind, had been placed the draped bust of Curtius, a work of the Berlin sculptor Schaper, being a copy in Pentelic marble of the one which ten years ago was presented to Curtius by his friends and admirers on his seventieth birthday, and which now forms one of the greatest ornaments of the quiet house in Berlin. The inscription upon the pedestal of the Olympian bust runs as follows: "ERNST CURTIUS—ΕΡΝΕΣΤΟΣ ΚΟΥΡΤΙΟΣ. Von Freunden und Verehrern gewidmet am 2ten September, 1894. 'Η ἑλληνική κυβέρνησις τιμῆς ἕνεκεν ἐνθάδε ἵδρυσε."

The exercises were opened by Prof. Wilhelm Dörpfeld, First Secretary of the Imperial German Archæological Institute at Athens, who, in a speech of masterly eloquence, gave a rapid sketch of Curtius's work at Olympia, and in conclusion called upon those present to join with him in crowning this latest of the Olympic victors with the crown of wild olive. He then withdrew the light covering which hid the bust, amid great applause. M. Kavvadias, General Ephor of Antiquities in Greece, then spoke in the name of the Greek Government, accepting the bust, and dwelling at length upon the great services which Curtius had rendered to the world of art and letters. Other speeches followed, notably that of M. Homolle, Director of the French School at Athens, whose graceful tribute both to Curtius as a scholar and to German achievements in archæology, was much appreciated. Wreaths of laurel were presented by Prof. Percy Gardner, in the name of the British School at Athens and of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, and by Mr. Richardson in the name of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Dr. Dörpfeld then crowned the bust with a wreath of wild olive presented by Miss Jane Harrison in the name of the Empress Frederick of Germany, and with a wreath of laurel from the Crown Princess Sophia of Greece. In conclusion, enthusiastic cheers were given by the audience for Curtius, for Greece, and for Germany.

The ceremony at the Museum was followed by a banquet, under the genial auspices of Dr. Dörpfeld, at which, besides the opening toast to the King of Greece, whose warm interest in the work at Olympia was dwelt upon by Dr. Dörpfeld, numerous toasts were proposed to Curtius by the representatives of the different literary and scientific bodies present. In conclusion, a congratulatory telegram to Curtius was read aloud by Dr. Dörpfeld, to which the company responded with applause, a copy being afterwards passed round for the signatures of all present, to be sent to Berlin by post.

It may not be amiss here to state briefly the facts with regard to Curtius's work at Olympia, which is now a matter of twenty years ago. As far back as 1837, when Curtius, then a youth of three-and-twenty, made his first visit to Greece, the idea of excavating at Olympia had already taken firm hold upon him. It was not, however, until the 10th of January, 1852, when he gave his famous lecture on Olympia before a large and scholarly audience in Berlin, that the matter was brought before the public. The enthusiasm awakened that evening in the minds of all his hearers, but particularly in that of the Crown Prince Frederick of Prussia, was destined to bear its fruit, though at a somewhat distant day. The outbreak of the Crimean war, the financial and political troubles at home, all combined to make an undertaking of the sort an impossibility for many years to come; but at length, after the successful termination of the war with France, the hour arrived for the fulfilment of Curtius's plans. The excavations at Olympia were undertaken by the German Government, at a cost of nearly a million of marks, in the name of the German people now for the first time a great and united nation. The Reichstag passed a unanimous vote for the raising of the necessary sum, and, in 1874, sent Curtius as plenipotentiary to Greece to make arrangements. On the 27th of April, 1874, a treaty was drawn up and signed at Athens, giving Germany the right of excavating at Olympia for a period of ten years, under certain conditions to be observed by both parties. A committee was appointed at Berlin, consisting of Curtius, Friedrich Adler, and Busch. At the same time, a staff of trained archæologists and architects was appointed, which had the direction of the work at Olympia, and personally conducted the excavations during the whole period of six years.

The task undertaken proved to be no slight one. The Altis itself, or sacred enclosure of Olympia, measuring some 200 metres by 175, had, owing to the inundations of the rivers Alpheios and Kladeos, entirely disappeared beneath a sandy deposit some five to seven metres deep. The entire extent of the region excavated included, however, much more than the Altis, as many buildings lay outside the sacred precinct. But the results amply justified the time and money expended. When the Hermes was brought to light, all who saw it felt that it alone more than compensated for the entire undertaking, while the rich harvest of bronzes and sculptures, of coins, inscriptions, and terracottas, not to mention the *forty* buildings found, more than fulfilled the hopes of all who had so eagerly followed the course of events.

No account, however, of the excavations at Olympia would be complete without at least a passing mention of the forerunners of the work. The idea of excavating at Elis was by no means a new one with Curtius. Already in the course of the last century, no less than four scholars, representing respectively France, Germany, and England, had called attention to the fact that in all probability a rich harvest awaited the fortunate excavator at Olympia. The learned Benedictine Montfaucon in 1723, Winckelmann in 1763, Chandler in 1766, and Fauvel in 1797, all both felt and urged the desirability of ascertaining what still remained of the ancient splendors of Olympia. The two latter, indeed, were fortunate enough to be able to visit Elis themselves—a difficult thing in those days—and to see the ruined temple of Zeus in the midst of a desolate plain. Curiously enough, it is Chandler who is generally given the credit of having first discovered this temple, whereas in reality it was Fauvel, who, though writing later than Chandler, was the first to rightly identify it as the temple of Zeus mentioned by Pausanias.

In the early part of the present century, three English travellers, Leake, Dodwell, and Gell, successively visited Olympia between the years 1801 and 1808, and to their accounts we owe many facts which otherwise would have been lost to our knowledge. Some twenty years later, in 1829, at the close of the Greek war of Independence, the French, following the example set by Napoleon in Egypt, landed a body of scientific men and scholars in the Morea, where for six weeks they engaged in excavations upon the site of Olympia, this being the first attempt at anything like a systematic undertaking of the sort. The Louvre owes some of its most interesting Greek sculptures to this campaign, which, however, was destined never to resume its labors, and it was reserved for Curtius, as has been said above, to carry out the project of his early youth only after a lapse of thirty-eight years.

Perhaps the most important result thus far of the excavations at Olympia is the unexpected light they have thrown upon the history of Greek architecture. The forty buildings brought to view represent, according to Prof. Adler, a period of more than nine centuries (from circa 670 B. C. to circa 250 A. D.) Some of them are unique of their kind—buildings known to us hitherto only through vague and often contradictory descriptions of ancient writers. Such are notably the Council Hall, the Treasure-houses, the Gymnasium, Palæstra, etc. Very important material has thus been added to our still imperfect knowledge of the development of Greek architecture. Perhaps the most interesting building of all is the Temple of Hera—the most ancient temple hitherto discovered upon the Greek mainland.

But although many questions have been answered by these excavations, many more still remain unsolved. As Curtius himself says, in his official report, "a work like that at Olympia can never be said to be *finished*." Indeed, many new problems have been opened up to the archæologist—a fact for which every true student should be grateful. The chief value of the Olympian excavation lies not so much in the separate finds, however valuable in themselves, as in the fact that it has opened up new horizons to the student of the past, and has added a touch of fresh truth to its somewhat indistinct colors. Curtius's example is one of steadfast devotion to an idea throughout a long series of years and under circumstances which would have utterly discouraged a lesser man. It is to his energy, enthusiasm, and noble perseverance that the world owes to-day one of its greatest advances in the history of Art.

D. KALOPOTHAKES.

BARANTE'S MEMOIRS.

PARIS, April 24, 1895.

THE Souvenirs of the Baron de Barante, published by his grandson, M. Claude de Barante, form a very valuable document for the history of our time. The fifth volume, which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has just been published, extends from 1832 to 1837, very critical years for the Government of July, which had to obtain its *droit de cité* among the old governments of Europe, and to put an end to the revolutionary movements which were a natural consequence of the overthrow of the Bourbons.

In 1832 M. de Barante was still at Turin, a most difficult diplomatic post. I have shown how in his despatches he noted the fact that, under a veil of the most reactionary sentiments and of a total subserviency to Austria, the Italian feeling was slowly growing, and that the hatred of the *forestieri* and the aspiration for Italian independence and unity found accomplices in the highest ranks of the nation, even in the royal family of Piedmont. M. de la Tour, the minister with whom Barante had to deal, seems to have had large and clear ideas on many points. Speaking of the state of Greece, he said to Barante: "It is quite possible that Europe will have to occupy itself with Greece. The Ottoman Empire is going to pieces. The Pasha of Egypt is striking perhaps the last blow. The partition would be a great affair." Metternich had already said in Paris, in 1827, during a journey which he made to that city, that Greece was a dangerous spot. "We must know what we want. If it is the destruction of the Ottoman Empire, let us go at once to the end. Let us divide Turkey and reorganize Europe; if not, let us abandon Greece to herself." The battle of Navarino had been followed by the creation of the kingdom of Greece; the Egyptian question was not settled. M. de la Tour wanted a Congress. "It is evident," writes Barante, "that the interest of the House of Savoy would be identical with that of France. It would see a way of realizing what has always seemed to it its destiny—that is to say, the establishment of a kingdom which would embrace all the north of Italy."

M. de la Tour regretted that Europe had not chosen a Piedmontese Prince for the new kingdom of Greece, especially since Europe had made very good terms for this new kingdom:

"Without speaking," said he to Barante, "of our right to Achaia, which still figures among our titles, it would have been better to choose an Italian. The community of manners and of language is greater between Greeks and Italians. Trade has established continued relations; our navy renders the communications frequent. No European establishments have lasted so long in the East as the Italian establishments. We could have offered only the second son of the King, a child, or Prince Carigman, of the younger branch, who is seventeen years old. But, so a regency had been adopted, this would have been no objection."

On July 28, 1833, the statue of Napoleon was replaced with great pomp on the Vendôme column, in presence of the King, the Princes, the Marshals. M. Thiers was there on horseback, in his minister's uniform, and it was at his signal that the veil fell which covered Napoleon. The Duchess de Dino was in London at the time with Talleyrand; she was one of Barante's faithful correspondents, and wrote to him: "At a distance I could not readily imagine this scene in the Place Vendôme, where my little friend Thiers appeared as drum-major, and where, for the greatest glory of all, people screamed at the same moment, 'Vive le roi! Vive l'Empereur! Vive la Révolution!' One must have been there, and have gone successively through the rapid transformations of Paris, to understand it or find it simple. Decidedly, I am horribly *rouillée*, and people will find me so much behind the times that I shall be ashamed."

I would recommend to those who are interested in the diplomatic history of France in our time an official despatch of Barante's dated Turin, May 8, 1834, which gives an account of the relations of France and Piedmont during the year 1832. It is impossible to paint more accurately the difficulties with which the Government of Louis Philippe had to deal during that period, the jealousies of the great Powers, the petty opposition which was made everywhere to a King who was looked upon as a usurper, the animosity of the Legitimist party in Turin, the fears of the Court of Sardinia. The incidents which troubled the Powers are now well forgotten, and in reading the despatches of Barante we feel at times as if we were in a *terra incognita*. We can hardly understand passions which resemble so little our own. *Où sont les neiges d'antan?* says the poet. Where is the Holy Alliance? and where are the Carlists of Turin? The incidents of parliamentary life in Paris formed the chief element of the vast correspondence of Barante. Time has deprived them also of their interest; the letters of Molé, of Guizot, of Thiers, of the Duke Decazes have become less interesting than the more familiar letters of the Duchess de Broglie and the Duchess de Dino.

The Duchess de Broglie had a tender soul and a poetical mind; she writes from Coppet: "How sweet it would have been to find ourselves in this place where we were once so young, where we lived such a strong life. Coppet is now a temple, a serene and peaceful temple." She has visited the battle-field of Waterloo: "It moved me much, but makes one think more of the greatness of the fallen man than of those who triumphed over him. The lion which they placed in this great solitary field seems like the image of the conquered more than of the conqueror." The Duchess de Dino wrote generally on politics, but she was not pedantic; at times she had great delicacy of touch. You may judge by this:

"Your own disposition prepares you to receive mild impressions better than painful ones. This is what I call being happily born, and it is also what makes people keep their equilibrium better, and preserve a clearer heart and mind, near you than near anybody else I know. I have often experienced this; I am grateful to you for it, and it is what makes me particularly regret you here [she writes from Rochecotte], where more than one cloud has passed over my thought which your amiable disposition, your sweet and discreet friendship, would certainly have blown away. You are not the person to whom I have told most of the particulars of this life, but you are the person by whom I have always felt best understood; you have never insisted on what appeared to you, and the extreme delicacy with which you indicate without articulating makes your company singularly comfortable, sweet, and agreeable. I am quite pleased to make this avowal to you."

These lines do equal credit to Barante and to the writer: they are singularly delicate, and suggest that Barante must have been a very delightful friend. On the following page we find a long letter of Cavour's, but, such is the exigency of chronological order, Cavour appears in it very different from what we afterwards saw him. He is writing from London, in 1835; he is completely absorbed in political economy; his observations on the state of parties are, I am obliged to say, very commonplace. The true Cavour was still in the bud.

In September, 1835, Barante was appointed Ambassador to St. Petersburg. It was a most difficult post in those times, as the relations of France and Russia, which were very cordial before 1830, had been completely altered by the Revolution of July. The Emperor Nicholas affected to treat Louis Philippe as a usurper; he considered himself the chief representative of the doctrines which had ruled Europe since 1815; he felt great irritation towards a revolution which was in opposition to these doctrines. Moreover, the Revolution of 1830 had had its effects in Belgium and in Poland; it had also drawn France and England together, and this modified the political relations of all the European Powers. Nicholas was an autocrat, and had no need of concealing his sentiments, as Austria and Prussia were obliged to do, to a certain extent. The French embassy to St. Petersburg was, in consequence, almost a post of danger; but it was felt that it could not be in better hands than those of Barante, who concealed the firmness of his doctrines under unimpeachable good manners and great moderation of character. Barante received his instructions from the Duke de Broglie:

"Without being blind to the advantages which the close alliance of the cabinet of Saint-Petersburg formerly had for us, we understand perfectly that, in the present circumstances, not only would it be dangerous to reëstablish it, but even there would be a dangerous blindness in seeming to desire it, and to direct ostensibly towards this end the combinations of our policy."

Barante stopped at Weimar, where he saw the Grand Duchess, sister of the Emperor of Russia. "She is evidently very *spirituelle*, but her deafness, her union with a husband who is evidently so inferior to her, her life in a little provincial town, all gives her an air of sadness and discouragement. Thirty years of such a life do not seem to have inspired her with any resignation." He remained some time in Berlin. "The atmosphere of Germany seems to me even more pacific than the atmosphere of France [in 1835]. Berlin seems to me more *bourgeois* than thirty years ago. Nothing is heard but reasonable words."

Barante was received for the first time on January 10, 1836, by the Emperor of Russia, who treated him at once as if he had always known him, and talked with him on all the affairs of Europe with an easy and familiar volubility. He spoke of Louis Philippe "without embarrassment, without bitterness, but also without any show of affection." He knew how much Europe owed to him for the preservation of peace; he had undertaken a very difficult task. He spoke of the courage shown by the King when his life was attempted, of what the Queen must have felt. "'You will have to make some new laws; you will come to it.' 'That will depend on circumstances,' I replied; 'with our form of government and in our situation, we must wait till public opinion is warned and enlightened.' 'Well, then, the merit consists in taking advantage of the moment.'" Nicholas spoke lightly of the new kingdom of Greece, of the new King. "I think him a little mad." The Emperor was adverse to creating constitutional institutions in Greece. "One of the difficulties of the country is the number of Greeks who have been brought up abroad, and who bring back habits and ideas to a country where they are without application."

How happy Barante must have been, in his exile at St. Petersburg, to receive letters from his French friends. On January 14, 1836, the Duchess de Broglie writes to him:

"Dear Prosper: I write to you amidst the preparations for a ball. Our winter is a succession of festivities of which you can form no idea. People are convinced that they ought to sing and dance from morning till night in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

order to consolidate the Government. I sometimes think that something better could be done. When I came back on July 30, 1830, to Paris, silent and calm after such a terrible crisis, with the trees of its boulevards torn, the streets full of barricades, I hardly thought that I should soon be obliged to give parties like those of the old régime. It is fortunate, it is better so, more rational; but somehow the result is a sort of discouragement and of disdain for human affairs. Is there so little difference between things different? The world becomes very uniform; material objects are getting more and more assimilated; we have everywhere the same feasts, the same flowers, the same carpets, the same suppers. Life seems to be taken *à la entreprise*, and governments, too. The originality of which we have dreamt, the seal which we should like to see on all the acts of those we love and our country—all this is a dream. We must take our hearts somewhere else, and it is even better not to speak of it. I finish thus this tirade, which is not very clear."

It is clear enough; it shows in the Duchess de Broglie a person who was better than the world she lived in, a soul tormented by a higher ideal, a pessimist, a dreamer. She had something in her of the genius of Mme. de Staël.

Polish affairs hold a very important place in the despatches of Barante. He soon understood that Russia was particularly sensitive on the question of Poland. Nesselrode complained bitterly of the reception which the Polish refugees had met with in France; Russia had never received nor encouraged the Carlists. The Emperor was in a constant state of irritation on the subject; he complained also constantly of England. Barante was not long in perceiving that Nicholas was even more hostile to England than to France. Orloff told him once: "If you knew Lord Palmerston as I do, you would know that he is capable of anything; he is a man of passion and of vanity. Remember the bombardment of Copenhagen in 1807, in time of peace, when England had been trying to inspire Denmark with full security. Who knows if they don't now want to bombard Cronstadt? We know that there is a difference between England and France: you don't believe that we are preparing to conquer Constantinople or to occupy the Dardanelles; you would not embark in a senseless war with her; it would be a general war, a convulsion for all Europe."

Correspondence.

THE REVELATION CONTAINED IN THE MADISON LETTER.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The Madison letter published in the *Nation* April 25, 1895, *never before published*, is "newly discovered evidence" of the highest character, being the testimony of that witness who is now universally conceded to have stood first in the world of the framers of the Constitution.

It contains a revelation in regard to the intent and purpose of the term "direct taxes" as used in the Constitution, and in regard to the understanding of the people of the United States concerning that term when they adopted the Constitution; and, what is still more extraordinary, it shows that the term, in the estimation of the men who used it, did not refer to the kind, or character, or nature of the tax itself, and that the framers of the Constitution never considered the subject of taxation from the philosophical or politico-economic point of view, but were wrestling with the stern necessities of the question, How shall the people of these several States be induced to pay a Federal tax? The letter also shows that all the learned arguments upon the economic questions what is a direct tax, and what is not a direct tax, and what did the world know about direct and indirect taxes in 1787, may be thrown into the waste-paper basket.

On the 29th of January, 1789 (after the adoption of the Constitution, but before the organization of the new Government), Madison wrote to "Col. G. Thompson," setting forth his "sentiments" in relation to a proposed alteration of the Federal Constitution, and giving his reasons why he disliked "a change of that part of it which authorizes direct taxes." He says to Col. Thompson, in the beginning of the letter, "Should I judge amiss, your candour will excuse the communication. Should I judge aright, your discretion will make a proper use of it." Col. Thompson, in the plenitude of his "discretion," did not "make a proper use of it," and Madison, apparently, having submitted the question of publication to Col. Thompson, did not feel at liberty to publish it himself, and the letter has remained unpublished until on the 25th of April last it was brought to light through Mr. Worthington Ford.

Here let it be clearly apprehended that the great question before the Supreme Court is simply this: What is a direct tax within the intent and meaning of the Constitution? If the income tax is a direct tax, it must be laid and apportioned among the several States in the ratio of representation. Massachusetts having, say, a third as many representatives in Congress as New York, the citizens of Massachusetts collectively must pay only one-third as much of the entire income tax as the citizens of New York, etc., etc. This apportionment among the States not having been made in laying the income tax, it is unconstitutional if it is a direct tax. Conversely, if the income tax is not a direct tax, it does not come within these restrictive clauses of the Constitution. It has followed, of course, that the forensic struggle has been to show, on the one side, that the income tax is in its nature a direct tax; that it bears directly on the individnal citizen who pays it; that it is not an excise, etc.; and on the other side that it was not a tax known to the framers of the Constitution; that it was not a tax which they had or could have had in mind when they used the term "direct taxes," and hence that they did not intend to restrict that kind of a tax to distribution among the States in the ratio of representation. In other words, it is argued that the restriction was intended for certain *kinds* of taxation then known to the framers specifically and termed "direct taxes."

Madison first alludes to the apparently conceded fact that the ordinary expenses of the new Government would be met by duties, or by duties and excises. Concerning the ordinary revenue of the Federal Government, therefore, there was then no dispute. It was provided for. Everybody knew what duties were and everybody knew better then than everybody knows now that an excise was an English tax laid upon a domestic commodity. So far there was neither State nor sectional jealousy.

But there would be wars and national "emergencies." Then the future Government would need extraordinary revenues. Blockades might cut off imposts and even reduce the ordinary revenue. The nation already knew by bitter experience what it cost to carry on war without money and without credit. How should this extraordinary revenue be provided when the day of necessity should come?

Manifestly it could be raised by but one of two methods: either *indirectly*, by "requisitions" on the several States, as under the still existing Confederacy, or by taxes laid *directly* by the Federal Government. Duties and excises were not indirect taxes, they were not under discussion or consideration; they were not in the case at all. *Indirect taxes* were taxes procured indirectly by "requisitions" on the States; *direct taxes* were taxes laid *directly* by the Federal Government. The framers of the Constitution evidently had never looked at the subject from a politico-economic point of view; they had never given a thought to the philosophy of taxation; the term "direct taxes," as they used it, did not refer to the kind or character or nature of the tax, but to the fact that such taxes were no longer to be laid indirectly through "requisitions" upon the States, but directly upon the taxpayer by the newly constituted taxing power. Indirect taxes would be a thing of the past, of the expiring Confederation; taxes directly laid by the future Government would supply its extraordinary revenue when needed.

But here State jealousy had entered into the problem which the framers were solving—the difficult problem of taking power from the individual States and transferring it to this new, unknown, and distant central authority. If Congress could lay a tax directly upon the property of the citizens of all the States, might it not be so laid that the citizens of Virginia would have to pay more than the citizens of New York? How should the power so transferred be restrained?

The Convention answered the question by the word population. The new power of direct taxation should be given to Congress, *but the system of quotas*, with which the people of the country were familiar, *should be retained*. The inhabitants of Virginia, thereafter as theretofore, should contribute under this new power of direct taxation only the old quota of the whole amount laid upon all the States. The means would be by the direct taxation of the Federal Government; the amount (or proportion) would be precisely what it had been before. The safeguard of ratio remained inviolate; only the agency of collection was changed. The power of direct taxation should impose no greater liability upon the taxpayer in any State than the power of raising money by "requisition" had imposed.

But here another element of discord came in: Were slaves inhabitants or property? The previous limitation upon the direct powers of taxation was a safeguard; the next concession was a compromise. The slaves, the "other persons," should be reckoned at three-fifths of their actual number; and the power of direct taxation should be exercised, not literally in the ratio of population, but in the modified ratio of representation. And hence we have the clause, "No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken."

Attorney-General Whitney, in his recent argument, said that the term "direct taxes" is not to be found in any law or statute anterior to the Constitution. Madison now explains to us why the new and unknown and undefined term appears in the Constitution at all—because it stands for the power of direct taxation. The framers supposed when they were limiting the *thing* that they were limiting the power. Instead of saying, "The power of direct taxation shall be exercised only in the ratio of representation," they said in effect, "The taxes imposed by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new power of direct taxation (*i. e.*, the direct taxes hereby authorized) shall be distributed among the States hereafter as they have been heretofore, in the ratio of population as modified by the Constitution (*i. e.*, on the ratio of representation)."

Having now the historical situation plainly in view, let us turn back to the Madison letter and behold how clear the intent and purpose of the term appears, and that it was the two forms of taxation, direct taxes and State requisitions, which were kept in logical antithesis. At the outset of his discussion Mr. Madison states the question and brings the alternatives plainly to the front:

"The question to be considered then is, *which of the two systems, that of requisitions or that of direct taxes*, will best answer the essential purpose of making every State bear its equitable share of the common burdens."

They remain in the front. It is not direct taxes or duties; it is not direct taxes or indirect; the alternatives are: taxes coming direct from the general Government, or taxes indirectly levied by requisitions on the States.

"From the reasoning of many on this subject it would seem as if the question concerning *requisitions and direct taxes* was whether direct taxes shall be levied or not. This is by no means the case. If extraordinary aids for the public safety shall not be necessary, direct taxes will not be necessary. If extraordinary emergencies call for such aids, the only question will be *whether direct taxes shall be raised by the General Government itself, or whether the General Government shall require the State Governments to raise them.*"

He carries these alternative necessities to the end of his argument: Direct taxes or requisitions? Extraordinary revenue, shall it be levied directly by the Government or indirectly through the States? And with the recognition of these alternatives is the recognition of the existing quotas measured by an equal rule of taxation which might be philosophically imposed when each State would contribute only its just proportion.

"But besides these general considerations, which affect every part of the Union, there are others which claim the most serious attention of the southern parts of it, & of Virginia particularly. *If direct taxes be prohibited, and no reliance can be placed on Requisitions* the inevitable consequence will be that whenever public exigencies arise, the duties will be accumulated on imports, until they shall have yielded every farthing that can be squeezed out of them. Now who is it that pays duties on imports? Those only who consume them. What parts of the continent manufacture least and consume imported manufactures most? The southern parts. It is clearly the interest of the southern parts, therefore, and of Virginia particularly, that trade should not be overburdened; but that *direct taxes when necessary* should come in aid of that fund; *since being laid on all the states by an equal rule provided in the Constitution, they tend to equalize the general burden on every part of the continent.*"

His political sagacity was never more incisive than when Madison intimates in this letter that it is the commercial and manufacturing States which have reason to distrust the provision that allows Congress to exercise the power of direct taxation. N.

WASHINGTON, May, 1895.

CAUSE AND EFFECT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Having read your strictures upon the Grand Army with a feeling that it was not a full statement of the case, I greeted with pleasure the mild protest of "C. F. B." from Washington. May I quote as a text the main point of his letter?

"I submit that if you will bring your censure of the pension laws and administration of the last fifteen years or so to the test of reason, you will lay the blame, not on the Grand Army, but on that bad working of our political system that throws the public affairs and the powers of government into the least worthy and capable hands, and leaves the better people to indifference and despair, except when they rise in revolt against some abuse that has grown too scandalous or oppressive to be borne."

In analyzing this plea we have to bear in mind that Congress is made up in one house of 356 members from districts, and in the other of members from forty-four States. There is no person in either house who represents the nation or is responsible for the public interest. No member has any authority or any legitimate influence over any others, so that his interference with them on behalf of the general interest is naturally regarded as an impertinence. There is no leadership and no common rallying-point. Getting a majority, therefore, means an accumulation of units much as the coral insects are said to build up islands in the West Indies, with the difference that these are permanent, while the other structures are as shifting as the kaleidoscope. Of course, party is the chief cement, but party has come to be only one of the instruments by which private interests work out their schemes. Now the building up of a majority in this way is a task of such stupendous difficulty that it can be undertaken only by those possessed of immense resources, either financial or political. But if these resources are big enough, there is not much doubt of the result, because there is no, or very slight, opposition to be feared from the public interest, which is wholly unrepresented. All the circumstances favor attacks on the public purse, while the defence is reduced to a nullity. This is the whole secret of the success of protective tariffs, the free-silver interest, big naval expenditures, and of such combinations as the Sugar Trust and the Standard Oil Company.

It lies at the root, also, of the pension business. There are certain men in Washington, known as pension agents, whose business it is to secure pensions for applicants, for a commission (we will suppose) of 10 per cent. A pension law, therefore, which, by means of arrears, would involve no more than one hundred and fifty millions of dollars—and I believe ours covers more than double that amount—would mean fifteen millions in the pockets of these gentry. As they are past masters in the art of manipulating Congress, all that they require is applicants. Go into any town or village, and you can hear endless accounts how the emissaries of these agents are scouring the country, entering every family and stimulating it to find some member or friend or acquaintance who can present some trumped-up claim connected with the war. Is it any wonder that men should lend a ready ear to a paternal Government anxious to fill their pockets in spite of themselves? Is it any wonder that the Grand Army, from an honorable association based upon patriotic memories, should have been converted to a great extent into an instrument of the pension agents? The disastrous effects of our evil methods of government are far worse than a drain of the Treasury in that they tend to degrade and lower the character of our whole people.

Hear a few words from a French writer (M. Étienne Lamy, 'La République en 1883'), upon similar circumstances:

"For if nations make governments after their own image, it is still more true that governments give to the people their virtues in the long run and their vices with a terrible promptitude. Is it supposed that this people, if it reads impotence or servility on the forehead of its chiefs, will preserve intact its respect for authority, and meanwhile will remain inaccessible to the errors, to the abasement, of those whom it despises? How can the caprice of fortunes which nothing justifies, and the scandals of those which everything condemns, fail to turn aside the modest labor and the conscientious efforts upon which are raised with such slowness the success of honest people? . . . Such is the fecundity of error."

The antithesis to this picture is found in your own comments this week upon the English annual budget which has just been presented. A year ago, Sir William Harcourt, in a total amount of over 400 millions of dollars, estimated a surplus of $1,500,000. The actual surplus was $3,800,000, differing, on the right side, from the estimate by one-half of 1 per cent. on the total budget. The expenditure differed from the estimate by $420,000, or one-tenth of 1 per cent. on the total budget. It is just this thing, repeated in substance every year for half a century, which has made English national finance beyond all comparison the first in the world. Can any one compare it with ours of the last ten years without a blush of shame?

Yet the difference is not in the character of the people, except as the British has been raised by a long period of the example of such government, nor in the character of the House of Commons as compared with our Congress. It is simply and solely because the English finances are managed by one man, not necessarily a trained financier, while ours are managed by a mob. If we wish to rescue our Treasury from becoming more and more an object of contempt and laughter to the whole world, the only possible resource is to put the Secretary into Congress and let him fight his way if he can, and as, in the long run, he in all probability will, to the position of an English chancellor of the exchequer. G. B.

BOSTON, May 10, 1895.

POE'S MORAL NATURE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you permit me to correct a statement made in your notice of the new edition of Poe? It is of some consequence because it implies a wrong notion of the copyright law, about which it is important that literary people should not have indefinite or hazy ideas. You say that the publishers "have taken advantage of the recent expiration of copyright," which you date from the issue of the works of Poe edited by Dr. Rufus Wilmot (not William, as you have it) Griswold in 1850. But nothing was covered by the 1850 copyright except the editor's "memoir." Poe's tales and poems had been published from twenty to four years previously, and the copyright on any contribution could not have extended, under the most favorable circumstances, more than forty-two years from the date of first publication. If all legal requirements had been complied with, the copyright on 'The MS. Found in a Bottle,' for instance, would have expired in 1875. But, in fact, if there had been any copyright on this production, it would have ended in 1861, and that on Poe's last published article in 1878, the original term of copyright (twenty-eight years) never having been renewed, since neither the author nor his wife was alive at these dates. Nor would it have made any difference, except in half-a-dozen cases, if he or she had then been living, for, with these exceptions,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Poe's writings were published in uncopyrighted periodicals, and were not individually entered.

In view of the additional light thrown of late years on Poe's career, and the fact that the *Nation* has several times pricked the bubbles blown by Ingram and other admirers, it is strange that your present critic should blame Prof. Woodberry for mentioning other faults than his hero's drunkenness and irritable temper. "His worst faults," you say, "were as surely congenital as was his genius." His worst faults, however, were not the ones named, but his utter lack of honor. Nor was this lack the result of ill treatment or misfortune. His first employer, T. W. White, whose honesty and even generosity are admitted even by Poe's defenders, declared, from his early knowledge of him, that "he was an unmitigated rascal." But his moral character is perhaps best illustrated by incidents related in a letter lately written to me by one of his few surviving contemporaries, and which I desire to put on record:

"Jan. 10th, 1895.

"My Dear Sir:

"The incident to which I alluded was as follows: Poe called on me one day in great glee and said: 'I have a good joke on Griswold. I met him the other day and suggested to him that he should get me, through his publishers, to write a review of his last work, "The Poets and Poetry of America." He said it would be a good idea, and that he would speak to his publishers about it, and said, "I *am* sure they'll pay *fairly*, and I think you can go on and do the work without waiting." Well, I wrote the review, and, a few days after, handed it to him, when he gave me the money for it from the publishers.'

"'Well,' I said, 'this is nothing more than the ordinary bookseller's device, and I dare say your review was a fair one and will be of use to the work.' 'There lies the joke,' he replied. 'I began at the very beginning and did not allow a single merit in the book: I assailed it to the extent of my powers, and should like to have seen Griswold's face as he read the manuscript.' I looked at him and said, 'That is a very good joke, doubtless, for you, but Griswold and the publishers paid you; of course you returned the money?' 'No,' said he, 'I spent it.' He had not the least idea that he had been doing a very contemptible thing, and it was impossible to get angry with him because, in spite of his unsurpassed ability in certain lines of literary work, he was in morals an absolute idiot.

"In other instances I remember that he showed this lack of appreciation of right and wrong, and one of them was his trip to Boston. He came to me one day looking very dilapidated, and I knew from that fact he was just recovering from indulging to excess in liquor, for Poe was naturally a very neat man in his person, and dressed with great care even when poorest. Whenever you found him slovenly or careless in his dress, you knew that he was on a drinking bout or he had been on one. I said to him rather testily: 'You have been on another of your sprees.' 'Well,' he said, 'it is the last; I never intend going on another.' I said, 'I have heard that so often it has lost its force with me, but what can I do for you? what do you want?' 'Well,' said he, 'I don't know what to do; I am in a strait.' 'What is the matter?' 'Well, you see, they have invited me in Boston to deliver an original poem, and I have been in such a condition that I am unable to do it; I have got to go next week.' 'Well,' I said, 'write to them that you have been indisposed, because you have been (I consider it a case of disease in you), and postpone the event.' 'But,' said he, 'I want the money.' 'Well,' I said, 'you can't get the money without you earn it.' He said, 'I'll fix it,' and went off. The next thing I heard was that he went down to Boston and read 'Al Araaf,' a poem which he wrote when he was a young man (he said when he was a boy, but that is another of his figments). They were disappointed. It was not what they expected, but they treated him with great courtesy, gave him a supper, and, speaking under the influence of champagne and excitement, he let the facts out. Of course, they became very indignant, and when Poe came back he wrote an article in the *Broadway Journal* in which he assumed that he had gone there with this poem in order to test their acumen. He had not the least notion that he was doing anything wrong. He never had. Anything that he did was right, regardless of its morality, or lack of it; and everything he said was true to him, however false it might be. I could cite numerous instances of his recklessness of assertion and bold statement without basis. In morals, as I have said before, he was an idiot. . . ."

Yours, etc., W. M. Griswold.

Notes.

Dr. Elliott Coues's edition of the 'Expeditions of Zebulon Montgomery Pike to the Headwaters of the Mississippi River, the Interior Parts of Louisiana, Mexico, and Texas, in the Years 1805-6-7' is now definitely set down by the publisher, Francis G. Harper, for appearance in the early fall. The reprint will be in three volumes, and Dr. Coues's pious labors have more than doubled the original matter. His annotations have been as minute and painstaking as in the case of his Lewis & Clark, with which the later publication will be uniform in style. The plates of the edition of 1810 will be reproduced in facsimile, and there will be added a folding historico geographical map of the Upper Mississippi. Only 1,500 copies will be printed, in two styles.

Macmillan & Co. announce a new series of "Royal Naval Handbooks," to be edited by Commander C. N. Robinson, author of 'The British Fleet.' First on the list is 'Naval Administration and Organization,' by Admiral Sir Vesey Hamilton.

Archibald Constable & Co., London, have in preparation 'Icebound on Kolguev,' Russia's Arctic island, by Aubyn Trevor-Battye, with numerous illustrations, and a work on Nicaragua by Archibald Colquhoun, author of 'In the Shan Country.'

'Modern Opera-houses and Theatres' is the title of a sumptuous work in three volumes with 220 plates which Messrs. Edwin O. Sachs and E. A. E. Woodrow propose to publish through B. T. Batsford, 94 High Holborn, London. It is to contain descriptions with plans, etc., of all the best of the recent European playhouses; but the prospectus does not suggest any inclusion of American theatres, some of which certainly are worthy of insertion—the Metropolitan Opera-house, the Casino, and the Madison Square Theatre in New York, and the Auditorium in Chicago, for example.

M. François Descoste, who was one of the earliest of the "Ralliés," and who published in 1893 two volumes on the 'Jeunesse de Joseph de Maistre,' which were crowned by the French Academy, will bring out this month a new work in which he continues his previous studies. This will be entitled 'Joseph de Maistre pendant la Révolution,' and it will contain some unpublished letters which display great perspicacity on the part of De Maistre. He predicted the course of the Revolution with remarkable accuracy, and as early as 1796 called Bonaparte the future King of France.

A new volume of the 'Journal' of the Goncourts, the eighth, will appear during the present month. This, unlike its predecessors, will see the light first as a volume, and not in the form of feuilletons; M. de Goncourt being of opinion that his work has been made to seem more fragmentary than it really is through its appearance in instalments. In order to avoid the annoyance which some of the later volumes gave to M. Alphonse Daudet, the author has read the notes of the present 'Journal' to his friend, who repays the civility by lavish praise of the new book.

A book of Charles Baudelaire's, hitherto unknown, will soon appear. The good luck of such a find as that of an authentic manuscript of the author of the 'Fleurs du Mal' fell to the lot of M. Félix Grélot and Professor Mainard of the Collège Chaptal. They discovered and bought it at a public sale. 'Les Mœurs et Coutumes de la Belgique' is the title of it, and it is said to treat the Flemings, men and women, with harsh and brutal satire.

M. Paul Bourget has had much trouble in the choice of a name for his new novel. M. Huysmans forestalled him in the use of 'En Route,' and when he thought to fall back on 'En Marche,' he found that that title also had been advertised some time ago in the announcement of a forthcoming volume by Mme. Séverine. So he is still *à la mer*, if one may venture to say so.

The Appletons have brought out a handy Spanish-English and English-Spanish dictionary—a much-abridged Velazquez. So far as our tests go, no sources have been consulted except the larger Velazquez, as we discover nothing changed in the abridgment except the accentuation; this has properly been made to conform to the Academy's new rules. There is a new sub-title, making claim to "the latest scientific, military, commercial, technical, and nautical terms," but we perceive no enlargement in these lines. The necessary brevity of definition and almost entire absence of idiomatic phrases would often make this little volume a blind guide to beginners in Spanish; but for a traveller's ready reference and quick handling it is well adapted, and its clear print and neat binding are attractive.

As Meinhold's 'Amber Witch,' in Lady Duff-Gordon's excellent translation, has now been before the English-speaking public for fifty years, and as Messrs. Nutt & Co. (London) feel justified in reproducing it in a very handsome illustrated edition, we may presume that criticism has pronounced its final verdict upon it, and that it has the *Genius* (in the Roman sense) without which, as Martial tells us, a book cannot hope to live. It is a little surprising, considering the romantic possibilities and fascinations of horror involved in the witch superstition, that romancers have not made more of it. In fact, Balzac and Hawthorne excepted, we cannot at the moment remember any novelist of really great powers who has made it the motive of fiction. And when it has been handled, it has usually been approached from the wrong side; the romancer taking the modern view, and implying his indignation at the dense stupidity, irrationality, and horrible cruelty which the modern mind sees in the whole thing. But the higher artistic possibilities lie in the treatment from the opposite point of view—that of the thorough witch-believer, to whom humanity is, in very terrible truth, environed by the powers of darkness, and a trifling neglect, a hasty expression, or the malignity of a crippled old crone, may unlock a postern and let the world of horror burst in. It is from this point of view that Meinhold, as Pastor Schweidler, has treated his subject, and it is this that makes his narrative so effective.

A third edition of M. Gaston Paris's 'La Poésie du Moyen-Âge' having been called for, the distinguished philologist thought himself justified not only in issuing it, but in adding a second volume of the work under the same

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

title (Paris: Hachette), for which all students of literature will be deeply thankful. Two only of the articles in this volume have been composed since 1885, the date of the publication of the first volume, the others ranging from 1871 to 1884. The subjects of these articles vary; "La Littérature Française au XII^e siècle," "L'Esprit Normand en Angleterre," "La Poésie Française au XV^e siècle," being among the most interesting. That on "Les Contes Orientaux" will be read with pleasure in connection with the discussion of the question of their origin in Bédier's 'Les Fabliaux,' reviewed in these columns two years ago. It is gratifying to find M. Paris setting his face like a flint against that wrong-headed chauvinism, one of the forms of protection, which is at the present time seeking to keep out of French literature all foreign influences, even though Sarcey and Lemaître, and occasionally Larroumet, are among its promoters and defenders. "The intellectual world," he says, "is the world of free trade, and the more one imports, the more is one likely to export." These pages of his preface are pregnant with truth.

'La Fortune Privée à travers sept siècles' (Paris: Armand Colin & Cie.), by Viscount G. d'Avenel, is a summary of his large and important work, 'Histoire Économique de la Propriété, des Salaires, des Denrées et de tous les Prix en général, depuis l'an 1200 jusqu'en l'an 1800.' In this summary the subject is treated no less exactly but more popularly, with the view of placing the results of M. d'Avenel's investigations within the reach of a larger circle of readers. He has the art of making matter which, from the necessary accumulation of facts, risks being dry, quite attractive.

A few years ago Michael Bernays resigned his professorship in the University of Munich and retired to Carlsruhe for the purpose of devoting himself exclusively to literary studies. The first fruit of this leisure is a work entitled "Schriften zur Kritik und Literaturgeschichte," in four volumes, the first of which, 'Zur neueren Literaturgeschichte,' has just appeared (Stuttgart: Göschen). More than one-half of this volume is given to a criticism of Voltaire's tragedy "Mahomet" and Goethe's rather free version of it. The title of this essay, "Der französische und der deutsche Mahomet," conveys a very inadequate conception of the richness and variety of the contents. It is, in fact, an admirable dissertation on the genius of Voltaire, keenly analytical and remarkably suggestive, and showing vast reading thoroughly assimilated. The same broad and truly scholarly treatment characterizes also the shorter discussions of "Goethe's Relations to Walter Scott," "Schiller's Letters to Dalberg," the originals of which are in the University Library at Munich, and "Goethe's and Schiller's Correspondence." Prof. Bernays exhibits a familiarity with the whole range of modern literature, American as well as European. On p. 314 he shows that Buckle's comment on Voltaire's tragedies is taken from Auger's article in the 'Biographie Universelle,' and on pp. 330-33 that a famous verse of four lines in Voltaire's "Alzire" is the almost literal translation of a passage in Rowe's "Tamerlane."

Three new English magazines make their first appearance this month. We have already received *Chapman's Magazine* (published by Chapman & Hall, and edited by the firm's manager, Mr. Oswald Crawfurd), which will confine itself to fiction, without illustrations. The first issue contains a short story by Anthony Hope, a romantic drama by Stanley Weyman, and the first chapters of a serial by Bret Harte. The *Twentieth Century*, "of the familiar half-crown type," will include literary and dramatic criticisms, and among its first contributors are Sir Edwin Arnold and Lord Byron. The *Catholic Magazine* has Lady Annabel Kerr for editor, and promises, for the popular price of sixpence, fiction, literary and religious matter, with pictorial accompaniments. Among its contributors are Lady Burton, Canon Barry, Mrs. Gilbert (Rosa Mulholland), and Mr. C. Kegan Paul.

A late number of the *Westminster Gazette* devotes nearly two columns to the "Football Butcher's Bill" in the United Kingdom for the past season, premising that the cases particularized "do not represent one-tenth part of the accidents." Analysis shows that there were 20 deaths, 53 fractures of the leg, 11 of the arm, 26 of the collar-bone, besides 68 severe injuries of various kinds. "Another distinguishing and peculiarly unpleasant feature of the football play of this season has been the increasing tendency of players and the public to visit their disappointments upon the referee."

Mr. Herbert Welsh will have entire control of a new four-page weekly, *City and State*, which adds another to the list of municipal reformatory publications so numerous at the present time. It will be issued from No. 1305 Arch Street, Philadelphia.

The *American Journal of Science*, now nearing the end of its third series and seventy-eighth year, presents in its current (May) issue a sketch of the late Prof. James Dwight Dana, with a bibliography, and a frontispiece portrait—a fine old Yankee face, comparable in science to Emerson's in ideality.

Visitors to the museum of the Royal United Service Institution at Whitehall, described by our London correspondent last week, will take increased interest in the building—the old Banqueting House—if they peruse the April number of the *Portfolio*. Mr. W. J. Loftie, with much antiquarian industry (not so sure-footed as to dispense with liberal conjecture), and with much intemperate zeal for the cause of Charles the First, exhibits the extent of the palace of Whitehall at the time of its partial destruction by fire, and the two ambitious designs for its rebuilding by Inigo Jones, who would have made of it the largest building in the world. A portrait of this famous architect and copies of old prints illustrate the narrative in a satisfactory manner. The most surprising revelation is, that while the Banqueting House was built with window-spaces, these were not pierced and glazed till a very recent period. "The ground-floor windows were opened first for the United Service Institution." The royal martyr was taken out to be beheaded through a hole knocked in one of the window-spaces.

The One Hundredth Bulletin of the Boston Public Library contains a chronological index of Norse historical fiction, including Denmark, the titles of works by and relating to Goethe, and a catalogue of the Thayer Library. This is the gift of four sisters, and consists of 5,269 volumes, chiefly "works of history and illustrative biography, some of which are rare and valuable." A great number of the volumes are "extended" by the insertion of portraits and plates. An idea of the collection may be gained from the fact that there are seventy-six titles under Theodore Parker. The illustrations of the Bulletin are a series of seven views taken from the State House in 1858, together with a view of the front of the building.

The annual report of the Geological Survey of New Jersey for 1893 contains an interesting chapter by Salisbury and Kümmel on Lake Passaic, a body of water once held between the Newark or Watchung Mountains and the Highlands, when the present outlet of the included lowland was blocked on the north by the ice of the glacial period. The existence of the lake was indicated in Cook's report for 1880; it is now more definitely traced by means of its shore-lines and deltas. During the greatest advance of the ice, an immense morainic embankment was built in front of it, forming the transverse ridge from Morristown eastward. As the ice melted northward, various shore benches were built. They now no longer stand level, but ascend slightly to the north, rising 67 feet in 25 miles, thus indicating a northward elevation of the land since the disappearance of the lake. The outlet of the lake was by a notch in the trap ridge near its southwest end, now 331 feet above sea-level. The discussion is well illustrated by a large-scale map, by far the most elaborate representation of a feature of this kind yet published in this country. It is worth noting that the investigation was facilitated and the conclusions firmly established through that mapping of the surface geology of the State which the Survey has initiated, and in which it is a pioneer. The report concludes with a detailed list of minerals of New Jersey and notes of mineral localities, in the interest of investors and prospectors; this will be elaborated and republished if found of practical value.

The Senatus of Aberdeen University has resolved to confer, at its forthcoming commencement, the degree of LL.D. on a woman. The distinguished recipient of this unusual honor, Miss Jane E. Harrison, is already a member of the council of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, presided over by Prof. Jebb of Cambridge, and is an accepted authority on Greek archæology, notably vases. It will be remembered that Columbia College, at its centenary in 1887, conferred the honorary degree of L.H D. on Miss Amelia B. Edwards, in recognition of her studies in Egyptology; but Miss Harrison will be, we believe, the first woman to receive such a degree from any British University. In international accord with this action of the University of Aberdeen comes the announcement that an English student, Miss Grace Chisolm, has received from the University of Göttingen a Ph.D. degree in mathematics, likewise stated to be "the first degree conferred on a lady by a German university." Miss Chisolm, a daughter of the former warden of the Standards, had previously won first-class honors in mathematics at both Oxford and Cambridge, without, of course, any chance of a degree.

The University Extension Summer Meeting will be held in the buildings of the University of Pennsylvania, July 1-26. There will be a session of the department of Civics and Politics, with lectures from three to four hours daily. The director is Mr. Edward T. Devine, 111 South Fifteenth Street, Philadelphia.

—The reader of President Hyde's 'Outlines of Social Theology' (Macmillan) would be sure to think the author very young, for all his "semilunar fardels," were it not that before now old men have renewed their youth when drinking of the new wine of Hegel. The President of Bowdoin is one of many who are delighted with that vintage, and also one of those who seem to have learned nothing from those "fine days for theology," as Strauss called them, when Hegel himself rejoiced in his system like a conjurer in his bottle, and produced from it the whole body of the Lutheran theology, and even the Lutheran consubstantiation. When,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a little later, Feuerbach proceeded to produce from the same system his atheistic 'Essence of Christianity' with equal facility and as good warrant, the wiser began to suspect that here was the prophet's compass, "which, when I had taken it in my hand, did turn whichever way I would." Ignorant or forgetful of all this, many, since then, have found in the Hegelian metaphysic the rationale of their orthodox theology. As time goes on, "the form of sound doctrine" gets to be more and more purely formal, less and less sound. Dr. Hyde carries himself in quite an orthodox fashion, and has grave admonitions for heretics of various names, but his own doctrine, stripped of all disguises, resembles the traditional orthodoxy far less than it resembles the heresies which it deplores. His Christianity is a neo-Christianity, its several doctrines such as would have cost him his "good and regular standing" in any evangelical church fifty or even twenty years ago. But we have changed all that. Dr. Hyde will not be tried for heresy, and he will get more praise than blame from the traditionalist organs for his ingenious device for keeping up appearances. It should be said that both his general ideas and his neo-Christian doctrines are often reasonable and impressive, but the connection of the latter with the former is purely arbitrary. The conclusion is not in the premises. Hegel did not find the facts more plastic to the idea in his 'Natur-Philosophie' than Dr. Hyde has found those of historical Christianity. Evidently his studies have not taken him in the direction of New Testament criticism. His conception of Jesus is purely subjective—what "social theology" demands, and not what criticism requires. The whole thing is prophetic of the opposition with which a consistent rationalism will have to deal in the near future—an opposition essentially rational, but masquerading in the clothes it has inherited from former generations.

—M. Albert Vandal has just brought to an end the very curious and interesting series of letters of Napoleon which he has been publishing in the *Revue Bleue* in the numbers running from March 30 to April 20. These letters were written in 1808-9 by Napoleon I. to his ambassador in Russia, Caulaincourt, Duke of Vicenza, and until now have been sought for fruitlessly. M. Vandal himself made a long and patient search after them at the time when he was engaged on his 'Napoléon et Alexandre Ier,' but all in vain, though he, or his correspondents, ransacked public and private archives throughout France and Russia. Caulaincourt's letters were found, but only one brief note, and a fragment of a letter of Napoleon's. M. Vandal, then, had to gather the Emperor's thoughts and plans as best he might from such portions of them as were quoted in the ambassador's replies. A little while ago, however, some papers left by the Count de la Ferronnays, who was ambassador in Russia under the Restoration, were intrusted to M. Costa de Beauregard for a literary purpose. Among these was a *dossier* containing the long-missing letters. It is likely that these were still in the Russian archives at the time when the Count de la Ferronnays was ambassador at St. Petersburg, and that he had them copied for his private collection of state papers. There is no possible doubt of their authenticity.

—The dates of February 2, 1808, and April 10, 1809, mark the beginning and the end of this correspondence. The story that is told is of the course and the ending of the flirtation with the Emperor Alexander which Napoleon began at Tilsit. On the French side, indeed, it seems to have been much more than a flirtation. Napoleon would have been glad to make of Russia the pivot on which his European policy should turn. He even seems to have considered seriously his old dream of the conquest of the East by means of a Franco-Russian alliance. He had captivated Alexander at Tilsit, and he strove by every means to maintain his supremacy over that (as he thought) changeable and flighty soul. So he sent Caulaincourt, a man greatly in his confidence, to St. Petersburg, and wrote him with his own hand, constantly, the most minute directions. Courier after courier bore instructions how best to flatter Alexander's wishes, or dissipate his fears, or excite his hopes. Everybody knows how the attempt failed. The Spanish rose; Austria, unchecked by Russia, attacked; Alexander refused to Napoleon his sister's hand, and so the mirage faded. Besides their historic interest, these letters show once more that amazing mastery of details which was characteristic of the genius of Napoleon.

—The fourth volume of Dr. Hans Blum's 'Fürst Bismarck und seine Zeit' (Munich: Beck) records the history of four eventful years from the formation of the North German Confederation in 1867 to the ratification of the Peace of Frankfort and the close of the first session of the Imperial Diet in 1871. The volume begins with an account of the visit of King William to the Paris Exposition in June, 1867, accompanied by the crown prince, Moltke, and Bismarck, who was made the special object of hostile demonstrations on the part of the Parisian populace. Napoleon, however, showed him marked attention, and even consulted him as to the propriety of introducing parliamentary institutions into France. Bismarck advised him to do so, but at the same time warned him that such a conciliatory measure would not suffice to preserve and perpetuate his power, which could be effected only by a strong and well-disciplined imperial guard, wholly devoted to his interests. Bismarck was convinced that the chief danger of war would arise from the desire of the French Emperor to impart strength and stability to a rootless and rickety dynasty, and that the best means of maintaining peace would be to make him feel that he was firmly seated on his throne and could turn a deaf ear to chauvinistic clamor. The French prime minister, Marquis de Moustier, held himself aloof from these discussions, remembering doubtless the sharp retort which he had received in 1855, when, as French ambassador in Berlin, he ventured to criticise the course of Prussian politics and to suggest that it might lead to Jena. "Why not to Leipzig and Waterloo?" was Bismarck's ready reply. The publication in parallel columns (p. 247) of the original Ems despatch and Bismarck's condensation of it is a complete refutation of the charge that Bismarck provoked the war by the falsification of this important document. The account of what occurred in the interview of Benedetti with the King of Prussia is essentially the same in both papers; Bismarck added nothing and omitted only a few circumlocutional and superfluous phrases, but his terser version of the facts set them forth in a clearer and stronger light, and sent a thrill of patriotic indignation and enthusiasm through the whole German people from the Alps to the Baltic, so that Moltke was perfectly justified in exclaiming: "Before, it was a *chamade*, now it is a *fanfare!*"

—Blum gives a concise and cursory sketch of the war of 1870, making only casual mention of military movements and feats of arms, but dwelling on diplomatic incidents and other occurrences more or less personal to Bismarck. During the discussion of the Luxemburg question in the French Chamber, Thiers made a speech in which he declared that the political unity of Germany was a menace to French power and prestige, and that to sow dissension between the German States and to keep them divided had been "the inviolate policy of France since the days of Louis XIV." When Jules Favre came as a negotiator of peace, and asked, in a melancholy and injured tone, with whom Germany was waging war now after the battle of Sedan and the fall of the Empire, Bismarck, remembering Thiers's remark, replied, "With Louis XIV." The answer also clearly implied that one of the conditions of peace would be the reclamation and recovery of Alsace and Lorraine, which that monarch had annexed to France. At a parliamentary soirée given by Bismarck on July 12, 1869, the Bavarian delegate, Dr. Joseph Völk, expressed his surprise that Prussia had not resented, *vi et armis*, the provocations of France in the Luxemburg affair. Bismarck paused for a moment and then said: "I have passed a long and painful week in thinking over this question of a war with France. Not that I fear defeat, for Moltke assures us that we shall conquer. The point to decide was whether we should enter upon such a conflict even with the certainty of victory, and we resolved not to wage war unless forced to do so. We have considered the immense losses and the sorrow and distress brought upon thousands of families. Believe me, gentlemen, I have a heart as feeling as yours. War is always war. The misery of the countries it devastates, the anguish of widows and orphans—all this is so terrible that, for my part, I should never resort to it except in a case of extreme necessity." Numerous instances are given of Bismarck's kindness of heart as shown in his care for the comfort of the common soldier and especially of the sick and wounded.

—The spirit of Fichte and Vom Stein is not moving the powers which guide the destinies of popular education in Prussia at the present time. According to statistics gathered from the *Pädagogische Zeitung* (Berlin), the leading State of Germany is sadly behind the middle and small States in the care for her common schools. While in Bavaria 13,500 classes, in round numbers, are in charge of 13,600 teachers, aside from over 10,000 special teachers of religion, drawing, singing, etc., there are in Prussia only 70,000 teachers to 82,700 classes, and the number of children under one teacher is sixty in the former and seventy in the latter state. In 1891 the average salary of the Prussian common-school teachers was 1,203 marks, inclusive of all perquisites, and their condition has not been bettered since then; in Bavaria, in 1892, the average income, exclusive of perquisites, amounted to 1,496 marks. In Prussia 30,730 teachers receive less than 1,050 marks (7,600 less than 650 marks, and many of these less than 540), while the minimum figures in the minor States are as follows: Baden, 1,100 to 2,000, according to years of service; Saxony, 1,000 to 1,800; Hesse, 1,000 to 1,600; Saxe-Weimar, 950 to 1,600; Saxe-Gotha, 880 to 1,630; Saxe-Meiningen, 1,000 to 1,800; and in the little State of Anhalt, 1,100 to 2,100. Compulsory attendance at the *Fortbildungsschulen*, which receive the children after the completion of the course in the *Volksschule* and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provide for further instruction from the fourteenth to the sixteenth or even the eighteenth year, is well-nigh an accomplished fact in Saxony, Hesse, Baden, and Saxe-Weimar, while Wirtemberg and Bavaria are not far behind. If a similar requirement existed in Prussia, some 1,800,000 children would be found in these institutions; the actual number, however, is insignificant. There are no recent statistics on the subject, but in 1890 the attendance in the rural schools of this class was little over 11,000, and in the budget for 1895-96 only 30,000 marks is set down for this item. In Bavaria 344,500 children receive instruction during their fifteenth and sixteenth years. The tone in which the above-mentioned organ of the German Teachers' Association discusses the questions of popular education in the fatherland is on the whole admirable in its moderation, independence, and evident conviction of the full import of the deplorable situation.

SAMUEL J. TILDEN.

The Life of Samuel J. Tilden. By John Bigelow, LL.D. Harpers. 2 vols., 8vo, pp. 416, 442. 1895:

Mr. Bigelow's long and close intimacy with Tilden, and his own large experience in politics and in authorship, made him naturally the literary executor of his friend, as he was a trustee of his estate. The resulting biography, now before us, has an assured historical value corresponding to the importance of Mr. Tilden's career by reason, first, of his efforts at municipal reform in the city of New York, next of a similarly wholesome movement in the State, and finally of the memorable contest for the Presidency of the nation in 1876. It raises, moreover, an interesting psychological problem, when the question is asked how he came to be the factor he was in the stirring events of a critical time in the history of his city, his State, his country. What was the physical, moral, and intellectual make-up of the man by which he was fitted to take so prominent, and in the main so honorable, a part as a leader of the best elements of his party in administrative reforms?

The crisis in Tilden's life was, of course, the Hayes-Tilden contest for the Presidency. Before that time he seemed to have been called from the work of a successful and industrious lawyer to sudden glory as the leader of a great popular movement to rescue the city and the State from the fangs of Tweed rings and Canal rings. He was carried on the crest of the wave of popular favor, and was made the leader of his party by a fiat which the political managers of the time had no choice but to obey. If Tilden had any capacity for the enjoyment of gratified and honorable ambition (and this seems to have been the strongest sentiment in his nature), the two or three years before 1876 were the fruition and the satisfaction of his life.

The canvass for the Presidency and the struggle over the counting of the vote opened a period of detraction and vilification which, no doubt, wretchedly embittered the life of both Tilden and Hayes for several years, and left painful wounds which were never wholly healed while they lived. These two men, whose personal lives were pure and who were both singularly free from the vices, grave or petty, which cast stains on private reputations, were yelped down by the dogs of partisan politics till they stood at bay, breathless if not despairing, and might themselves well doubt their own consciousness of honorable purpose, and wonder whether they were not, without knowing it, the vilest of men. One side of this horrible picture Mr. Bigelow has given with full detail, backed by the voluminous documentary support which Congressional investigations and blue-books can give. We wish he had regarded his task more completely that of the historian, and, as he has discriminated between the acts and purposes of Mr. Tilden himself and those of the less scrupulous agents of his party, had judged with equal discrimination in regard to the moral attitude of Tilden's opponent. But to this we shall recur.

Mr. Tilden's physical and mental constitution was peculiar from his childhood. Born of the stock of English colonists of New England and New York, his ancestors for two or three generations were farmers in the lovely valley of the upper Hudson, and he was the first of his stock to exchange country life for a professional career. Severe illness in early childhood left him with a weakened digestive system, and the consequent lack of full nutrition kept him all his life frail in body, and made his existence a long regimen of medication and careful diet. As often happens in such cases, the active brain outruns the body, and the boy who is excluded from the romping pleasures of youth grows precociously old in appearance and manner, and has, according to the old saw, a "gray head on green shoulders." Part of this is only manner, and is due to the constant association with grown people. In Tilden's case, however, the brain itself was of uncommon fibre, and the matter of his thought as well as his fashion of expressing it showed uncommon maturity. He was didactic from the cradle, and seemed impelled to analyze all the problems of life and conduct, and to formulate elaborate judgments for the guidance of himself and others. The gravity with which such children will lay down the law has something comical in it, growing out of the contrast between their lack of experience and their solemn unconsciousness of the need of it to justify their sweeping conclusions. But the crude egotism of youth is soon tempered by contact with the world, and, in Tilden's case, ceased to be offensive while it still remained "odd." Its traces were seen all his life in a tendency to lecture his audience, in the instructive and not in the fault-finding sense. He was sometimes prolix, always seriously argumentative, never oratorical or eloquent; but his matter was pretty sure to have weight and to command the attention of intelligent listeners.

His education was imperfect, for his delicate health interrupted his systematic studies; and although he began a college course at Yale, he spent less than a year in the college, and did not graduate. His zeal in politics was such, however, that although the boy was only a preparatory student in the academic course, he was already discussing political questions with Van Buren and writing practical advice in political conduct for the use of Jackson. He kept up this sort of touch with affairs during life, and both through the newspapers and in pamphlets and letters intended for circulation he loved to give his views on each new situation, even when he wholly refused to accept office or to seek the usual rewards of political activity.

His work at the bar was distinctively characteristic of his mental constitution. His mind was strongly analytic. His strength was shown most strikingly when, in a great mass of facts or of conflicting testimony, he applied his powerful analysis until the true and the false were exposed, and the material things were brought together in an impregnable array, to which simple legal principles were applied with the most telling effect. This power of finding a simple clue to the true theory in the midst of nebulous masses of conflicting statements often had the effect of genius, when it was, in fact, only a sagacious application of laborious and systematic analysis. This talent and power of work was of supreme value in unravelling the complicated affairs of corporations, detecting maladministration through the entangled business of years, furnishing at once the detection of the causes of ruin and the clue to a more hopeful management. He came to be looked upon as a sort of wizard who had magical powers of insight into that which was blind to others. There arose an extraordinary demand for his services, and his professional income surpassed anything before known at the American bar. A judicious and fortunate investment of it made him a rich man.

In all this his methods were those of an almost scientific induction, free from the seductions of eloquent advocacy, if not destitute of the graces of voice and of manner. He was always the equity barrister rather than the jury advocate. Even before a jury he treated the twelve men in the box as he would the chancellor, and made his impression by his lucid simplification of involved matters and his logical application of established legal principles.

His lack of the emotional was seen in every phase of his life. He cared little for poetry; fact, and not fancy, satisfied him. He did not marry, partly, no doubt, because his frail health furnished prudential reasons for the life of a social anchorite, but partly also because he lacked the warmer sympathies which lead to love. His seemed to be a somewhat cold intelligence, but he seems also to have been just, to have admired honesty, to have been true to principle, and to have had high courage when courage was not easy to find. All these qualities were shown in the victorious fight with the Tweed ring and the Canal ring, and he had fairly won the reputation of a fearless as well as a most able leader of reform at a time when scoundrels in power seemed so strong as to make it suicidal to attack them.

Such was the man and such the circumstances when he was made Governor of the State and the candidate of his party for the Presidency. The notorious scandals of Grant's Administration made a loud demand for reform in national affairs. Liberal Republicans hoped to secure it by the election of a reformer tested and tried within the party. Liberal Democrats secured the nomination of Tilden as one whose record was good security for an inflexible rule of good government in the Presidential office. In politics Tilden had been a "Barnburner" in 1848, and had supported Van Buren and Adams. In 1860 he still believed in the manifest destiny of America to be "all free," but fear of the consequences of secession and dread of civil war kept him in the ranks of the Douglas Democrats. During the war he was a war Democrat, and after the war he was earnest in advocating full and final acceptance of the constitutional amendments establishing freedom.

Looking back at the events of 1876 in the light of a fuller knowledge, we can now see that there was no more danger of a reaction against liberty then, had Tilden been elected, than there was in 1884, when Cleveland was elected. The situation did not warrant great excitement, much less revolutionary measures. The questions were really administrative ones

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and in no sense constitutional. It is, however, the nature of political controversies to exaggerate the importance of party success; and a great number of Republicans no doubt believed that the election of Tilden meant the loss of nearly all that was gained by the national triumph in the civil war. Feeling thus, they were prepared to be warped in their judgment of the means used to keep their party in power. This does not mean that they would applaud a false return or justify a forgery. It means that they could be easily misled by plausible assertions of unscrupulous managers, and easily blinded as to the real character of the things done by the returning-boards in Louisiana and Florida under the direction and advice of prominent Northern politicians.

Mr. Bigelow has conceived his office as biographer to be that of an advocate for Mr. Tilden and the Democratic party. He is a prosecutor, arraying the evidence of fraud and wrong in the elections in the contested States, in the making up of the returns, in the final count under the decisions of the Electoral Commission. He feels at liberty to ignore the history of the country and of the Southern States from the close of the war to the election of November, 1876. He thinks it enough to show that Mr. Tilden refused personally to authorize attempts to purchase electoral votes that were said to be in the market. At the same time he feels at liberty to hold President Hayes responsible, on the sole evidence of his accepting the office awarded him by the Electoral Commission, for all the detailed frauds and crimes that were committed in New Orleans or Tallahassee. This is not judicial; it does not even represent the settled public opinion which has gradually grown up, as time has quieted passions and given to men of average intelligence a better perspective of the contest of 1876 and the events which led to it. The significance of Mr. Tilden's life is almost wholly in its relation to history in a critical period. His biographer throws away his opportunity to become an authoritative interpreter of those events when he hesitates to take the historical view, and ignores the wrongs on both sides which led to the shocking demoralization of the time.

The civil war ended in the disfranchisement of the dominant and intelligent class in the South. Their struggle to regain leadership and political power was more or less revolutionary. The enfranchisement of millions of uneducated freedmen made them the tools of unscrupulous adventurers, and led to a saturnalia of misgovernment and peculation. This abuse of the governing and taxing power induced a resort to terrorism and "Kukluxism" as a corrective, because the white property-holders could not by legitimate means throw off the yoke. Kukluxism and the appeals to terror led the weaker and less intelligent into every manner of fraudulent stratagem to keep power. Each party could point to real abuses. No party ever did evil that good may come without finding that the slippery downward path led to anarchy, and to vulgar individual crimes of every name and nature, from robbery and embezzlement to forgery and murder. It is only mockery to show the obverse of the medal and refuse to exhibit the other side.

For the men who took part in conscious wrong doing, history will not have mercy. The "visiting statesmen" must stand in the pillory they have erected for themselves, and the only pertinent question will be as to the full extent of their guilty knowledge. Here, however, the biographer, by taking the partial view, weakens his case. As he insists, with justice, that Mr. Tilden is not to be held morally responsible for attempted purchase of corrupt electors by agents whom he disavowed, so he is bound to bring no similar railing accusation against Mr. Hayes without definite evidence of personal complicity with wrong. It is well enough to argue in regard to the vulgar herd of corrupt tools, that promise in advance to "take care of them," followed by appointments afterward to salaried offices, makes a good case of purchase. But to argue that the transfer of John Sherman from the Senate to the Treasury Department was a bargained reward for his visit to New Orleans is ridiculous. So, to say that Garfield's election to the Senate by the Ohio Legislature, and his subsequent nomination and election to the Presidency in 1880, were a similar payment for similar services rendered is equally absurd. The history of those political events contradicts the theory, and no contracting party is strong enough to warrant specific performance of such a bargain if any one were fool enough to make it. The responsibility of the statesmen named may be grave enough, and the task of their biographers may be no light one; but Mr. Bigelow has done much to make it easier by offering so weak an issue for debate.

The historian's point of view will include the general corruption of politics, and the substitution of venal combinations to secure the offices, with their power and profit, for the patriotic organizations to carry out a large public policy for the general good. It will recognize the fact that returning-boards have not been confined to the Gulf States, but have been organized in nearly every Legislature of the Union, and in Congress; for the election committees of these bodies have scarcely pretended to disguise their purpose of "counting in" their own political friends in open contempt of the evidence of honest election. Reformers have demanded in vain that contested elections shall be decided by judicial bodies acting upon judicial evidence. The "counting in" of Gov. Turney by the Democratic majority of the Tennessee Legislature the other day is only the most recent example of the widespread need of the application of the methods of honest business to politics.

While we thus treat Mr. Bigelow's arraignment of the frauds of 1876 as a one-sided statement that does not rise to the plane of history, we must still reiterate the truth that it claims serious and thoughtful attention from every man who loves his country, and who desires, in the words of the reformers of 1876, "to make this a pure government once more."

THE MIGRATION OF SYMBOLS.—I.

The Migration of Symbols. By the Count Goblet d'Alviella. With an introduction by Sir George Birdwood. London: Constable & Co. 1894.

VARIOUS significations attach to the word symbol. As here employed, it means whatever so represents a person or thing, by general agreement or by analogy, that its presence alone may evoke the conception of the other. The cross stands for Christianity; the flag for one's country. Religious sentiment especially makes large use of symbols; those which have served as the figured representations of divinities have always commanded the highest degree of veneration. Such material vestiges of their beliefs transmitted to us by past generations form the subject-matter of this remarkable volume, the fruit of exhaustive labor expended in bringing together the latest discoveries in ethnography and archæology, in history and philology.

There is a kind of symbolism so natural as to be common to the human race—a disk for the sun, a crescent for the moon; possibly this is true of even more complicated analogies—a tree for human life, or an equilateral cross for the four directions of space. On the other hand, the borrowing of symbols is the commonest thing possible. Soldiers take their religious symbols with themselves to foreign lands; coins propagate them over immense distances. Egyptian scarabs are found from Sardinia to Mesopotamia, carried by the armies of the Pharaohs or the ships of the Phœnicians. To determine whether analogous symbols were produced independently, or were derived from the same source, we must look chiefly at the intricacy and singularity of the forms.

The earliest monumental forms of religious symbols are found to be but few in number. Of the most important of them the history is traced by our author, one by one, first among particular peoples, and then over the whole area of countries where they are found. His main purpose, however, has been to investigate the limits within which such symbols have been disseminated, and to discover how far in the course of their wanderings their meaning as well as their form may have been modified. Symbolical figures may have a common origin without necessarily having the same meaning; and they may differ in appearance and yet be genealogically connected. All this is what the title chosen for the book is intended to imply. The conclusion drawn is, that such religious symbols as are common to the different historical races of mankind have not originated among them independently, but have been carried from one to the other, either in the course of their migrations, or by conquest, or by commerce. There are but few exceptions to this rule, the truth of which is demonstrated by an overwhelming induction of instances ancient and modern.

There is, to be sure, another whole class of symbols, consisting in acts or rites, which are not touched upon in the present work. As already intimated, our author has confined himself to figured representations; and of these only such are specially investigated as from their importance or their complexity seem most likely to shed light on the general conditions that govern their transmission. These principal forms, as has been said, are but few in number. The most important are the Gammadion, or Swastica, a cross with its extremities bent at a right angle; the sacred tree of the Assyrians; the sacred cone of the western Semitic peoples; the Crux Ansata of the Egyptians, a cross surmounted by a handle; the winged globe of the Egyptians; the Caduceus, or winged rod, of the Phœnicians; and the Trisula, or trident, of the Buddhists. In our limited space we can do little more than present some of our author's conclusions in regard to these principal figures, so far as it is possible without the help of the illustrations, which form one of the charming features of the book; and we must of necessity pass over much of interest to be found in the vast mass of materials collected by him relating to other emblems.

The Gammadion is so named from its being a combination of the Greek gamma four times repeated. It is the most interesting as it is one of the most widely distributed of all the symbolical forms. It is found among all the nations of Europe and of Asia (with certain significant exceptions), in Africa, and in both the Americas. By the Anglo-Saxons it was called the *fylfot*; while in India it bears the name of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

swastica when the arms are bent to the right, and *sauwastica* when turned the opposite way. If the arms are rounded off while curving backwards, it takes the name of the *tetrascele*, or four-legged figure. From its constant presence upon altars, idols, priestly vestments, tombstones, and sepulchral urns, it is clear that it possessed the attribute of a talisman or amulet. Many have been the attempts to explain its mystical significance. It has been regarded as the symbol of fecundity, both as importing the union of the male and female principles, and as especially the symbol for the female sex; of water, from its resemblance to the meander, or Greek fret, from which it has been supposed by some to have been derived; of lightning, because it can be separated into two zigzags or interlaced Z's; and of fire, or rather of the fire-drill by which fire was generated by certain primitive races. But the tendency of recent investigators is to consider it a symbolical representation of the sun or of a solar divinity. This interpretation may be considered as substantially demonstrated, since Percy Gardner has discovered among the coins of the city of Mesembria in Thrace (a name signifying midday) one struck with the gammadion bearing in its open centre an image of the sun, and others stamped with the legend MEΣ, followed by the same symbol. The four branches are supposed to represent the solar rays in motion in the four directions of space. But the sun does not restrict itself to darting its rays in all directions; it seems also to be animated by a circular movement from east to west. To symbolize this a literal four-legged figure was sometimes employed, or the same thing was indicated by a three-legged figure, as the one form is found to run into the other.

The question naturally suggests itself, Where was the cradle of the gammadion, whence it was carried to the four corners of the Old World? In the attempt to solve this problem one thing, at all events, has been established: it is found to be almost the exclusive property of the Aryans. It occurs among all the Indo-European peoples (except the Persians); but it is completely wanting among the Egyptians, the Phœnicians, and the Mesopotamians. A reasonable explanation for this has been found in the supposition that the symbolism of those nations possessed other figures which discharged a similar function. The real talismanic cross of all those countries, stretching from Persia to Lybia, is the *crux ansata* of the Egyptian monuments; and their principal symbol of the sun is the winged globe. Where the gammadion predominates, neither of these symbols has ever taken root. A natural inference has been drawn from this that the gammadion is the survival of a symbolism of the common ancestor of the Aryans. Accordingly arguments based upon its predominance have been invoked towards the solution of the burning question of the Origin of the Aryans. Our author has provided a table in which he attempts to make out a genealogy for it upon alternative suppositions. According to this table the remotest periods to which it has been traced back are as it has been discovered by Schliemann at Hissarlik upon numerous whorls made of baked clay, and also in his excavations at Mycenæ, on the one hand; and, on the other, as it is found upon sepulchral urns of the so-called Villanova type, in certain cemeteries of northern Italy, classed as belonging to the early Iron Age. From this table it also appears that there have been two successive periods of the dispersal of the gammadion over the whole of Europe: one in prehistoric times, upon pottery with incised geometric decorations (the Villanova type); the other contemporaneous with the imitation of Greek coins. Now, which of those two periods, Hissarlik or the early Iron Age in northern Italy, is to be regarded as the earlier? In which direction did the current of emigration *via* the valleys of the Po and the Danube flow? Was it, as has been heretofore believed, westward at the time when the civilization of the Bronze Age was introduced into Europe, either by the Celts, according to Bertrand, or by the early Italians (Umbrians), as Helbig, Pigorini, and the Italians generally believe? Or was the emigration in the opposite direction, as maintained by those holding to the opinion, steadily growing in favor, that the Aryans originated in northern or central Europe, and spread thence in an easterly and southerly direction? If this were the case, Hissarlik and Mycenæ would be later than Villanova, and thus another burning question, the age of the so-called Mycenæan civilization, is opened up.

We think our author has not discriminated sufficiently in stating that the gammadion is found in Europe in the Bronze Age. That period is best represented by the *terremares* of Emilia, in the valley of the Po, and the gammadion has never been found upon the pottery of the terremares, although so stated by our author. This pottery has very marked characteristics easily recognizable; the most striking is a crescent-shaped handle. On the bottom, it is true, there are to be found various forms of the cross, chiefly equilateral; but these furnish no stronger argument for the presence of the gammadion than for the *crux ansata*. The fact is, that the gammadion does not occur in Italy earlier than in the well-known cemetery of Golasecca (or Sesto Calende), near the outflow of the Ticino from Lago Maggiore, and southward in the cemeteries characteristic of the early Iron Age, to be included among which is the one containing the peculiar "hut urn" shape, found under the lava on the Alban hills, near Albano. So, also, when our author makes the statement that the gammadion "occurs in the north and west of Europe, with objects of the Bronze period, . . . and seems to have been introduced into Germany, Denmark, Sweden, etc., in the same manner as that in which the Runic writing was brought from the Danube valley to the shore of the Baltic," surely he forgets that the Bronze Age in the north of Europe has been proved to be later than the Iron Age in Italy. As for the Runic writing, its introduction into the north was even as late as the sixth century B. C.

In Asia the gammadion occurs as early as upon a bas-relief at Ibriz, and upon a cylinder, both of which are regarded as belonging to the Hittite civilization; but it may very well have been derived by them from Hissarlik. In general the Hittite art seems not earlier than the ninth century B. C. Throughout the far East, in China and in Japan, the gammadion can be easily traced to the swastica of the Hindus; but how it came to the Hindus is a question quite as difficult as how it got to Europe. Our author inclines to the opinion that they derived it from the Caucasus, where an early civilization prevailed closely allied to the Mycenæan industrial and decorative type; but this still leaves a gap to be accounted for—why it is lacking among the ancient Persians. It still remains an archæological problem waiting for future discoveries.

In western Africa the gammadion has also been found upon some curious bronzes captured by the English from the Ashantees; and it occurs in both North and South America. Our author thinks it probably originated spontaneously among the Ashantees, and possibly upon this continent also, although he inclines to the opinion that the fact of its being employed as a religious symbol among the Pueblos implies an early communication between America and the Old World, probably by way of China or Japan. We fail to see much force in this argument upon the theory of its being a solar emblem. On the other hand, he has stated in a different connection that the pre-Columbian cross is a kind of compass-card, representing the four quarters of the heavens, from which come the four chief winds which bring the rain. This is the opinion that generally prevails among American archæologists, who have found a striking corroboration of it in an engraved shell gorget discovered in a mound in Mississippi. On this is inscribed an equilateral cross inside of a square, each of whose sides supports a bird's head turned in the same direction—the whole forming a veritable gammadion. In its simplest form two examples, made out of native copper hammered into a thin sheet, were found by Mr. Moorehead in the Hopewell mound in Ohio, as well as two others of a highly decorated pattern, in which a combination of secondary figures, circular, or resembling the petals of flowers, is set between the arms of the cross. All of these were exhibited at the World's Fair in Chicago and attracted a great deal of attention. When we bear in mind how essential to the support of human life over large portions of our continent was the maize-plant, it seems more natural to suppose that a religious symbol for the rain, on which its growth so much depends, originated here spontaneously, than to search for any foreign origin for it.

The Sacred Tree, one of the oldest of symbols, had its origin in Mesopotamia,—one of the oldest civilized centres. From its simplest form, a stem divided at the base, surmounted by a fork or crescent, and furnished with cross-bars midway, it developed into a tree of varying species. Later it grew to be of a highly complex and ornate pattern, but it was invariably associated with religious subjects. Finally, it always stands between two living creatures facing each other. At first these were shapes of monsters, such as winged bulls or griffins, or real animals. Later they were human, or semi human, personages, priests or kings, in an attitude of devotion. The migration of both these types can be readily traced. The tree between two monsters or animals passed from Mesopotamia, on the one hand, to India, where it was employed by the Buddhists, and after them by Brahmanical sects, and it has continued in use in that country down to the present time. On the other hand, it passed to the Phœnicians and from Asia Minor to Greece. From the Persians, also, it was introduced, through the Byzantines, during the Middle Ages, into Christian symbolism in Sicily and Italy, and it even penetrated to the west of France. The other type, placed between two human, or semi-human, personages, followed the same route into India, China, and Eastern Asia. It is also to be found in ancient Mexican and Maya codices, and this our author regards as additional evidence of a pre-Columbian communication between the Old World and the New. The autochthonist theory on the contrary finds in it merely a development of the rain-cross into a tree form, or a representation of the maize-plant in a foliated pattern as is seen in the well-known stele of Palenque.

Wherever found, in the Old World, certain

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

features seem always to obtain: the attitude and expression of the two human figures, the form of tree, the arrangement of the branches, and the frequent presence of a pair of volutes between which the stem arises. The origin of these volutes may be attributed either to the clusters which adorn the image of the Chaldæan palm-tree, or to the horns which were a distinguishing sign of divinity among the Assyrians. The tree itself varies in different countries; the constant reappearance of these accessories constitutes the essential feature of the symbol. A curious detail occurs among very different peoples, the presence of serpents sometimes twined around the stem, sometimes only placed in the background. From this, Christian art has borrowed the model of the scene of the Temptation. In some creeds the tree is replaced by other objects, an altar, an urn, or a pillar. Christian art frequently places at the side of the cross (its "Tree of Life") two living creatures, lambs, doves, or peacocks. When the use of armorial bearings began to develop in western Europe, heraldic art copied from Eastern fabrics the habit of employing pairs of animals opposed to each other, as supporters, and the fashion prevails to this day.

Among Semitic peoples the veneration of the Sacred Tree implies far more than the almost universal tree worship of primitive races on account of their utility. It stands either as a vegetable symbol of the divine power, as the female personification of the creative forces of Nature, or it is the image of a mythical tree endowed with some supernatural purpose or meaning. What could have given to the people of Mesopotamia the idea of representing their great Goddess of Nature by a tree? The explanation offered by Prof. Tylor is, that on the Assyrian monuments in the greater number of instances the sacred tree is a palm, toward which two figures seem to hold the point of a conical object, with a reticulated surface, which bears a close resemblance to the inflorescence of the male date palm. He finds here a representation of the fertilization of the palm by the artificial transferring of the pollen to the clusters of the female, or date-bearing tree, a process referred to by Herodotus as practised in Chaldæa. This seems to be a more reasonable explanation of the origin of the cone than that proposed by Dr. Bonavia, referred to in a recent number of the *Nation*, in which, objecting to the pineapple theory, on account of the American origin of that plant, he concludes that "the cones were cedar cones used as sprinklers of holy water." If Tylor be right, the Assyrians seem to have drawn from the sexual relations of the palm the same symbolism relating to the renewal and communication of life that other nations have found in human sexuality.

But the Sacred Tree, among the Semitic peoples, as we have stated, also represented a mythical object of varying significance. Sometimes it stands for the Tree of the Universe, whose summit is the sky and whose trunk the earth; or the Tree of Life, whose juice conferred immortality; or the Tree of Knowledge "of good and of evil." The Cherubim with flaming sword who kept the way of the Tree of Life in the Garden of Eden bear a much greater resemblance to the monstrous creatures which guard the approaches of Assyrian palaces than they do to the *Amoretti* of Christian art. The fruit of the Tree of Life, whether it were clusters of dates or bunches of grapes, yielded alike a fermented liquor, that elixir of life which finds an echo in the modern *eau de vie*.

The Aryans also had their mythical trees. Among the Hindus we find a similar Tree of the Universe, a Tree of Life, from whose leaves distilled the celestial *amrita*, the drink of immortality; also a Tree of Knowledge, whose sap begets poetic and religious inspiration. The Greeks had their Sacred Tree in the Garden of the Hesperides, with golden fruit guarded by dragons; and the Scandinavian mythology had its sacred ash, Yggdrasill, whose branches spread over the whole world and tower above the heavens. But our author does not find the explanation of the coincidence in the possession by both Semites and Aryans of the Tree of Heaven, of Life, and of Knowledge in a common origin. He sees only examples of the well-established fact of the migration of fables among nations differing widely in race and language. He thinks they are merely logical coincidences in the application of vegetable symbolism; or that enrichment and approximation of mythologies which follows upon the mutual exchange of symbols and of myths.

TYRRELL'S LATIN POETRY.

Latin Poetry: Lectures delivered in 1893 on the Percy Turnbull Memorial Foundation at the Johns Hopkins University. By R. Y. Tyrrell, Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Dublin. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1895. Pp. xxiv, 323.

Prof. Tyrrell speaks so warmly of the courtesy of his American hearers in various cities, and his volume shows so much learning, acuteness, and literary art, that it seems ungracious in Americans to review it unfavorably. And, indeed, if a book so attractive in appearance and in the design announced in the preface is disappointing, it is rather because the author seems to work under certain false conceptions than because he does not do with much skill what he sets out to do. He announces his purpose to be chiefly analysis and literary criticism, rather than biography and literary history, which is entirely right if he does not allow the first to override the second. For instance, when he declares that to make Horace's renowned "O Navis" refer to the ship of state is the work of "typehunting editors," he directly sets at naught the words of Quintilian.

His false conception seems to be this: something essentially new was to be said of the Latin poets, and this end of the nineteenth century has brought to light two new metrical canons, one abstract and the other concrete, by which all poetry may fitly be judged. The first seems to be that passion is the true note of the best poetry—a sort of corybantic or dithyrambic furor—enthusiasm according to the ancient sense of the word. He seems to forget that Apollo applied the bridle as well as the goads to the Sibyl. This view of inspiration is a favorite one at the present day; it has operated to revive the study and exalt the glory of Pindar, and, years before Prof. Tyrrell wrote, to exhibit Catullus as the master of Latin poetry to the proportionate disparagement of the controlled and moderate Horace. It stamps with approval some work of Burns which never ought to be reprinted, and raises to fame some much later writers who should be left in their obscurity. By this canon Prof. Tyrrell not only exalts Catullus, as Munro did before him, to a very questionable supremacy, but he finds in Lucretius, and even in Plautus, a passionate and fiery temper which has hardly been detected hitherto. He seems in his literary analysis to confuse such traits as frankness, sincerity, simplicity, spontaneity, and passion—shades of tone far from identical, and often inconsistent.

His second canon, sometimes curiously in conflict with the first, appears to be that Tennyson is the standard poet, both for design and execution; that we may test the work of any poet in any language or period, for praise or blame, by finding his parallels and contrasts to Tennyson. Now, without seeking to deprive this age of a single comfort it takes in its Tennyson, one may say that other ages have taken equal satisfaction in poets of wholly different metal; and to employ him as a new Procrustes strikes a note of agony on some sensibilities. Professor Tyrrell recasts Lucretius's grand sermon on death into the metre and style of "the Two Voices," which is a startling use of octosyllables; yet he cannot recall that Scott used that metre with success without calling his poems "metrical romances." The children of this age must allow old-fashioned people to suggest that when after-times shall discuss the endless question, "What is epic poetry?" they may find "The Last Minstrel" and "Marmion" nearer the ideal than "Elaine" and "Guinevere"; and may insist that, whatever Tennyson's genius, he is essentially the child of his time, and no more fit for use as a standard than any other writer who completely satisfied his own contemporaries—Cowley, for instance, or Pope.

Prof. Tyrrell dwells at the greatest length on Lucretius, Catullus, Virgil, and Horace; dealing with the other Latin poets rather by groups than individually, and giving them distinctly lesser space. On the first two names, though his handling is fresh and lively, he has no very new point to offer; but little not already indicated by Sellar and Munro, the influence of the latter being in some cases more powerful than healthy. To Virgil he shows almost entire justice; yet one must fear that if Lord Tennyson had not laid down the lines for admiration, it might have come less readily; for Virgil's restrained and refined force, and his absolute objectiveness, whereby the man is lost in his work, are in a very different strain from most of the self-proclaiming writers Prof. Tyrrell so generally admires. He does perceive the nameless charm of Virgil's poetry, which fixes it in memory and thought, interpreting just that part of ourselves which our own tongues never will. He gives an interesting appendix in continuance of Conington's essay on Virgil's English translators.

Of Horace himself Prof. Tyrrell takes a strange and, as he says, an unorthodox view; but heresy is not always truth. The universal regard which Horace has received with men of so many different minds seems to him misplaced; Horace painfully lacks originality and poetic sincerity; his satires are largely plagiarisms from Lucilius, as may be detected even from the *disjecta membra* which are all we have left of the Auruncan; his odes are simply mosaics: *tours de force* in the transference of Greek lyric metres, hardly ever revealing the poet's own soul. In one word—though he does not use it—he regards Horace as a good deal of a humbug. One wonders at this point why he regards it as unpoetical insincerity to talk about a love for Lydia which represents no real feeling, and yet only legitimate Fescennine wit when Catullus charges Cæsar with immoralities of which there is no real evidence. If we grant the criticism that much of Horace's most sparkling satire is only a washing of Lucilius's crystals from their native mud, it would only prove what this book

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

admits is true of Virgil, and is equally true of Shakspere and our exalted Tennyson. One reads Apollonius, and Greene, and Sir Thomas Malory, chiefly because they gave materials to the men who "founded the massy ore, and scummed the bullion dross." The poet is he who makes the poetry. To the second charge, that Horace's odes are merely elaborate and unreal metrical exercises, one very adequate reply is this: Your spontaneous poet, your impressionist, who works over nothing, will, like Catullus, like Dryden, put one glorious stanza in immediate juxtaposition with a commonplace one, and even with a vile one. But the warped and paradoxical nature of Prof. Tyrrell's view is well shown by a single typical instance. "Surely," he says, "Horace was struggling in the shackles of his metre when, in warning Pollio how difficult and delicate was the task of writing a history of the Civil War, he tells him that he is walking on treacherous ashes which conceal a fire beneath," this version being an inversion; and he goes on to say that this does not in fitness of language convey the sense it seems to. Past ages, which have supposed it was an admirably expressive metaphor struck out by a great genius, have been all wrong; it was merely incorrect language imposed by Alcaic exigency. Prof. Tyrrell loves "Maud"; his criticism may be paralleled by this one: to call the evening dew on the passion-flower a splendid tear ought to mean that the flower felt with the hero's passion; but evidently Tennyson forgot what the monks meant in naming the flower.

But to close by naming the crowning discovery of this book: there is a dedicatory sonnet to the city of Baltimore. Its sonorous lines convey the idea that that city felt decorous and tender hesitation about joining the Union arms; but that when she had done so, and not till then, the Southern hosts were swept away, and slavery abolished from the Potomac to the Gulf. This is equal to the legitimist histories, which taught that the armies of King Louis won victories at Jena and Wagram under the command of the Marquis de Bonaparte.

Lotos-Time in Japan. By Henry T. Finck. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. Pp. xvi, 337, with sixteen full-page photographs.

Mr. Finck does not tell us *when* he saw the lotos in Japan; but if, after the manner of historians in fixing the date of ancient texts, we collate the facts that he went in company with Mr. Shugyo, the ex-consul at New York, that he dined with Mr. Robert Blum, and that he possessed a visitor's ticket to the Third National Exhibition, we know indubitably that his trip was made in the summer of 1890. His three months' sojourn was a very profitable one for the enjoyment both of himself and of his readers; for he came to it with the fullest preparation in the way of reading and of experience in foreign travel, and, as he tells us, "a trained observer can see more in five hours than a careless spectator in five months."

Nevertheless, even the trained observer that Mr. Finck is can never quite escape the traveller's ruling fallacy of generalizing from insufficient data. Mr. Finck is marvellously clever in interpretation of national character, but he does sometimes nod as to particular facts. His idea that the Japanese live a domestic life, open to the public gaze, is based on seeing the houses of the humbler classes along the street; but the real charm of life in the house of a well-to do Japanese is exactly the privacy of it. Our author thinks that the Japanese nerves are shattered by "boiled tea-leaves," yet it was, after all, the Japanese who taught us that the boiling water should never remain on the leaves more than a minute. He insists on the propriety of "Mikado" for "Emperor," though scarcely any Japanese who have not lived abroad will understand what one means by it. He misses the beautiful allegory of the carved monkeys at Nikko, who bid us "Hear not [evil], see not [evil], speak not [evil.]"

But we must overlook these trifles in the face of Mr. Finck's success in the main and unique purpose of his book, to give "a convenient bird's-eye view, in a few brief chapters, of the principal points in which Japanese civilization is superior to our own. . . . I have tried to show that the Japanese have as much to teach us as we have to teach them, and that what they can offer us is, on the whole, of a higher and nobler order than what we can offer them." This is not the first time that this has been said, but it is the first time that the demonstration has been made so thoroughly. The spirit of his last two chapters, "The Esthetic Nation" and "A Superior Civilization," is shown in these passages: "The Japanese are the only truly artistic *nation* in the world—the Esthetic Nation *par excellence*." "In morals at least our equals, they are, in general refinement of manners and in social culture, far superior to Americans and Europeans." And these theses he illustrates copiously, from the experience of other observers and himself, by the facts of different phases of art and life. In doing this, he has done what many of us have tried to do, but never as systematically and convincingly as here. Mr. Hearn is of course the great apostle of the Japanese gospel to those who can appreciate the subtilties of character; Mr. Finck has made this gospel so plain that all can understand.

Let us make no mistake about this. Let us read once more the above sentences, that we may appreciate the force of each word and the significance of the whole. Let us understand, if we can, once for all, that our customary attitude of patronizing superiority is narrow, false, and grotesque. "How delightful," we think, "that the Japanese can fight with our modern tools of bloodshed, can work a parliamentary constitution, can build up a factory system. Very creditable, to be sure, this borrowing from us." Well, then, let us understand that if the Japanese are but children and "heathen" as to our material civilization, we are but boors and savages as to what we have to learn from them, and that the balance of self-gratulation and patronizing, if there is to be any, should be on their side. Can an American or a European conceive himself in an attitude of humility, of respectful consideration, of generous and equal fellowship, towards an Oriental nation? It is difficult—as difficult as it was for the sodden Pharisees to appreciate the significance of the New Dispensation in the person of a mere Carpenter. Nevertheless, the day will come, in the international comity of the far future, when our national Pharisaism will be seen in its true light; and Mr. Finck's book will have helped to that end.

Early Venetian Printing Illustrated. Venice: Ferd. Ongania; New York: Scribners. 1895.

This beautiful book, intended to "serve as a pattern to the printer and as a document to the student," fulfils the expectations raised by the prospectus. It consists of prefatory historical text, by C. Castellani, on the art of printing at Venice during the Italian Renaissance, on water-marks, and on the printing of music by movable types—an innovation claimed for Venice. Then follow 200 pages of facsimiles of illustrated or decorated works in chronological order, initial letters and other ornaments, printers' marks, and paper-makers' water-marks; and a brief essay on bindings is succeeded by photographic copies of elegant specimens. Borders, initials, marks, and letterpress are printed in color when the original calls for it.

The first facsimile is of the first book printed in Venice, Cicero's 'Epistolæ ad Familiares,' and the list includes fine editions of Terence, Livy, Ovid, Pliny, Quintilian, Justinian, Marco Polo, Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, the 'Hypnerotomachia Poliphili,' and a few Greek authors, as Strabo in the original, and Herodotus, Euclid, and Plutarch Latinized. The range in years is from 1469 to 1524, with a solitary instance of musical printing, dated 1539. In short, this collection reflects very strikingly the feverish activity of the dawn of printing in Italy, and to students of that art and of book illustration it affords a most convenient source of first-hand information. That printers and publishers can profit by it in the raising of their ideals of workmanship and standards of taste is also certain; yet a part of the lesson for them is lost owing to the failure to specify the occasional reductions in scale (the Justinian on p. 62 must be an example of this), as well as to the fact that the original margins are seldom indicated or preserved. Indeed, with a proper economy, Signor Ongania has utilized such spaces for his water-marks, initials, printers' marks, etc. The student, again, will find the indexing inadequate, in view of such a mixed arrangement. That by years is well enough, though it has some hiatuses; and the several classifications of the ornaments and type are welcome, so that, *e. g.*, we can easily track Aldus's anchor and dolphin through its several delineations. To all these should have been added a page-for-page index, naming and dating every item. But these deficiencies detract very slightly from the praiseworthiness of the execution of a scheme which might well be extended to other Italian cities.

Desideri Erasmi Roterodami Convivia e Conloquiis Familiaribus Selecta. Edited, with notes and vocabulary, by Victor S. Clark. [School Classics.] Boston: Ginn & Co. 1895.

"Revivals, too, of unexpected change," says the poet; and concurrently with the renewal of popular interest in Napoleon, scholars have been returning to the study of Erasmus. The slender text-book before us was announced, we believe, at least as early as the appearance of Mr. Froude's work on the great Dutchman, which itself was but the latest of a considerable series in recent years. The editor's aim has been primarily "to provide supplementary reading for Latin classes in secondary schools," and he has made a fairly entertaining patchwork of excerpts, with a liberty in omitting and welding which he frankly avows, but which he certainly carries too far when he confounds the speakers, as on pp. 7, 8, 12, 13, and especially 15, line 4. Mr. Clark has also deliberately disregarded the *formulæ* in which the 'Colloquia' abounds, and which make it preëminently available as a discipline in Latin conversation. Youngsters who have any linguistic aptitude like nothing better than to disport themselves in practising the tongue

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they are learning, and Erasmus is prodigal of equivalent and parallel phraseology answering to the needs of polite society. Mr. Clark sometimes seems to have admitted doublets unawares, as on p. 6: "Quid cunctamur capum hunc discerpere? *Quid trepidamus hunc gallum lacerare?*" Again, on p. 7: "Augustine, quid babes quod parum es hilaris? *Quid accidit tibi quod sedes tristior?*" And finally on p. 3, "*ut reducam in concordiam, ut pacem inter eos componam,*" where the duplication is masked by printing *et* for the second *ut*. There is a by no means sparse glossary at the foot of each page in addition to a full vocabulary at the end, and notes. These last seem to us pitched rather high for the class of pupils aimed at, and to be somewhat wanting in racy idiomatic renderings when opportunity not seldom offers. The discourse on the Alpine white hare that owed its color to the snow it fed on, ought in these days to have been annotated not by a flout at mediæval superstition, but by a reference to protective mimicry. Had Mr. Clark been a born bookmaker, he might have made a much more attractive disposition of the text. His blanks and his paragraphing are often perplexing. The proof-reading has been very careful. We remark only "sunc" for *sunt* on p. 47, line 12. *Cervisia*, p. 39, line 7, has not found its way into the vocabulary.

We may, after all, doubt whether a better book "studio iuventutem inlectare ad elegantiam Latini sermonis" (as Mr. Clark's epigraph reads) could not have been made out of the anecdotic portions of those philosophical works of Cicero which Erasmus kissed every time he read them (p. 27). Something here, no doubt, is learned of the scholar himself, his lore and the whimsies of his palate; but, to our thinking, a judicious abstract (say) of the "Puerpera" would have given a better idea of the man in his larger aspect, and would have left a more fixed and salutary impression. The interlocutors are but two, the theme single, and the conversation close, and the grammatical difficulties no greater than those encountered in Mr. Clark's selections. This Colloquy, however, would lend itself comparatively ill to pedagogic editing.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Allen, Grant. The Scallywag. Cassell. 50 cents.
An Aide-de-Camp of Napoleon: Memoirs of Gen. Count de Ségur. Appletons. $2.
Black, Barbara. Kate of Gotham. G. W. Dillingham, 50 cents.
Caine, Hall. The Shadow of a Crime. Boston: Joseph Knight Co. $1.50.
Cambridge, Ada. Fidelis. Appletons.
Crawford, F. M. Sant Ilario. Macmillan. 50 cents.
Crocker, U. H. The Cause of Hard Times. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 50 cents.
Daintrey, Laura. The Arrows of Love. G. W. Dillingham.
Davies, Gen. H. E. General Sheridan. [Great Commanders.] Appletons.
Defoe, Daniel. Of Royall Educacion. London: David Nutt.
DuBois, Constance G. A Modern Pagan. Merriam Co.
Eighty-seven Kisses. G. W. Dillingham.
Eggert, Prof. C. A. Racine's Athalie. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
Ford, Paul L. Jefferson's Notes on Virginia. Brooklyn, N. Y.: Historical Printing Club.
Ford, Paul L. The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. V. 1788—1792. Putnams.
Fowler, Prof. Thomas. Progressive Morality: An Essay in Ethics. 2d ed. Macmillan.
Fuller, H. B. With the Procession. Harpers. $1.25.
Furness, H. H. A Midsummer Night's Dream. [Variorum Shakspere, Vol. X.] Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.
Getz, John. Handbook of a Collection of Chinese Porcelains. Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Gilbert, Gustav. The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens. London: Sonnenschein; New York: Macmillan. $3.
Globe Treasury of Universal Knowledge. G. W. Dillingham. 50 cents.
Hanna, Col. H. B. Can Russia Invade India? London: A. Constable & Co.
Harper, Olive. What Do You Think? G. W. Dillingham. 50 cents.
Harrisse, Henry. Americus Vespuccius: A Critical and Documentary Review of Two English Books concerning that Navigator. London: B. F. Stevens.
Hastings, Elizabeth. An Experiment in Altruism. Macmillan. 75 cents.
Hobbes, J. O. Some Good Intentions and a Blunder. Merriam Co. 40 cents.
Holley, G. W. Magnetism, its Potency and Action. Boston: *Arena* Publishing Co.
Jarvis, Josephine. Froebel's Pedagogics of the Kindergarten. Appletons. $1.50.
Johnson, Lionel. Poems. London: Elkin Matthews; Boston: Copeland & Day. $1.50.
Keon, M. G. Dion and the Sibyls: A Classic Novel. Catholic School Book Co.
Kyle, Ruby B. Paul St. Paul, a Son of the People. 2d ed. Chicago: C. H. Kerr & Co. $1.
Linton, E. Lynn. The One Too Many. F. T. Neely. 50 cents.
Lowry, H. D. Women's Tragedies. London: John Lane; Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.
Mcore, J. W. The American Congress: A History of National Legislation. Harpers. $3.
Morris, Edward E. A Memoir of George Higinbotham. Macmillan. $2.50.
Newton, W. W. Philip MacGregor. Hartford: Student Publishing Co. $1.50.
Norris, W. E. St. Ann's. Cassell. $1.
Oesterlein, Nikolaus. Beschreibendes Verzeichniss des Richard Wagner-Museums in Wien. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
Owen, Prof. W. B. Cicero de Oratore. Book I. Leach, Shewell & Sanborn. $1.
Pauli, Reinhold. Robert Blake, ein Seestück, und Cromwell. Maynard, Merrill & Co. 40 cents.
Pemberton, Max. The Impregnable City: A Romance. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.25.
Pendleton, Louis. Corona of the Nantahalas. Merriam Co. 75 cents.
Raimond, C. E. The New Moon. Appletons.
Ratbbone, St. George. The Fair Maid of Fez. Home Book Co. 50 cents.
Rev. J. A. Weston. Historic Doubts as to the Execution of Marshal Ney. Whittaker. $3.
Roscoe, Sir Henry. John Dalton, and the Rise of Modern Chemistry. Macmillan. $1.25.
Ricketts, Palmer C. History of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. 1824—1894. John Wiley & Sons. $3.
Russell, W. C. The Phantom Death, and Other Stories. F. A. Stokes Co. 75 cents.
Savage, R. A. In the Old Chateau, F. T. Neely. 50 cents.
Scott, the Hon. Mrs. Maxwell. The Tragedy of Fotheringay. London: A. & C. Black; New York: Macmillan. $6.
Social Damnation. By One of the Damned. Lovell Bros. Co. 50 cents.
Shumway, H. L. A Handbook on Tuberculosis among Cattle. Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.
Southey, Robert. English Seamen. London: Methuen & Co.
Step, Edward. Wayside and Woodland Blossoms: A Pocket Guide to British Wild-flowers. Illustrated. F. Warne & Co. $2 50.
Sudermann, Hermann. The Wish. Appletons.
Sullivan, Sir Edward. Tales from Scott. Boston: Roberts Bros.
The Curse of Intellect. London: Blackwood. Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.
The Century. Nov., '94—April, '95. Century Co.
Thudichum, Dr. J. L. W. The Spirit of Cookery. F. Warne & Co. $2.
Townsend, Mary A. Distaff and Spindle. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. $1 50
Vanamee, Lida O. Two Women. Merriam Co.
Verrall, A. W. Euripides the Rationalist: A Study in the History of Art and Religion. Cambridge: University Press: New York: Macmillan. $1.90.
Watts, H. E. Don Quixote. New ed. Vol. II. London: A. & C. Black; New York: Macmillan. $2.
Wayne, C. S. The Lady and her Tree: A Story of Society. Philadelphia: Vortex Co. 50 cents.
Weed, Clarence M. Ten New England Blossoms and their Insect Visitors. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Weise, Prof. O. Unsere Muttersprache, ihr Werden und ihr Wesen. Leipzig: Teubner; New York: Westermann.
Weissinger, Rozel. What is Money? Louisville: *Courier-Journal* Co.
White, Percy. A King's Diary. Cassell. 50 cents.
Winter, John Strange. A Blameless Woman. International News Co.
Wright, Mrs. Mary T. A Truce, and Other Stories. Scribners. $1.
Zangwill, I. The Master. Harpers. $1.75.

JUST PUBLISHED:

KERNER & OLIVER'S NATURAL HISTORY OF PLANTS.

With 1,000 original cuts and 16 colored plates. Quarto. 2 vols. Vol. I. (bound in 2 parts) ready. $7.50 *net*.

"It is full of new and important views; the style is fascinating and the exposition of the subject philosophical and masterly. I can conceive of no book more likely to give an intelligent inquirer a firm grasp of the leading principles of life on our globe. It is a treasure-house of knowledge."—*Grant Allen.*

"A semi-popular work on plant life by the professor of botany at Vienna, admirably written. An English edition, translated under the supervision of Prof. Oliver, is having much success in Great Britain. It ought to sell largely here to college and public libraries, as well as to individuals, and I can heartily commend it."—*Prof. J. E. Humphrey of Amherst.*

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

Economic History Since 1763.

Compiled by Benjamin Rand, Ph.D. Third Edition with Bibliography. 8vo, $3 00.

"This book may be said to mark an epoch in the teaching of political economy in this country, and to make possible a new branch of study in the curriculum of the universities of America."

A Bibliography of Economics.

By Benjamin Rand, Ph.D. 8vo, $1.25.

This work embraces the more important English, French, German, and Italian authorities in general economic literature.

JOHN WILSON & SON,
UNIVERSITY PRESS, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

GUILLERMO DOBLACHE'S "*Picarillo*" (natural, unsweetened, unfortified table sherry), bottled in Port St. Mary's, Spain, and shipped in cases of one dozen bottles each. For sale by PARK & TILFORD, New York, and all wine merchants. Send for price list.

Yale Mixture.

A GENTLEMAN'S SMOKE.

You won't know the luxury of Pipe-Smoking until you use Yale Mixture.

A two-oz. trial package, postpaid, for 25 cents.

MARBURG BROS.,
The American Tobacco Co., Successor,
Baltimore, Md.

BIMETALISM.

By HENRY DUNNING MACLEOD, M.A.,
Of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Inner Temple.

SECOND EDITION. 8vo, $1.75.

"Persons interested in the silver question may read Mr. MacLeod's work with profit. It contains a fair statement of the issues, and discusses them with great intelligence and clearness."—*N. Y. Times.*

Sold by all Booksellers. Sent, postpaid, by

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,
PUBLISHERS,
15 East 16th Street, New York.

KINDERGARTEN SUPPLIES
at Schermerhorn's, 3 East 14th St., N. Y.

Copeland and Day, Boston.

THREE ELEGIES ON ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON.

1. Robert Louis Stevenson, and Other Poems. By Richard Le Gallienne. Octavo, $1.25. Title-page by Will H. Bradley.

Mr. Le Gallienne belongs to the group of young London poets whose work is artistic, imaginative, and realistic in method, and fresh even to daring in manner and motive.—*Hartford Courant.*

2. A Sea Mark. A Threnody for Robert Louis Stevenson. By Bliss Carman. Limp paper covers, 25c. 50 copies on hand-made paper, $1.00.

Another really poetic work from Copeland & Day is Bliss Carman's Threnody for Robert Louis Stevenson. Mr. Carman is a poet, a clear-spoken and earnest poet, strong of thought, firm of phrase, romantic in expression, and original.—*Springfield Republican.*

3. Robert Louis Stevenson. A Study by A. (lice) B. (rown). With a Prelude and a Postlude by L. (ouise) I. (mogen) G. (uiney). To be issued for private distribution. One hundred copies for sale. Octavo, $2.50.

69 Cornhill.

BACK numbers and sets of all magazines. For price state wants to AMERICAN MAGAZINE EXCHANGE, De Menil Building, St. Louis, Mo.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED